arXiv:1607.07944v1 [math.LO] 27 Jul 2016

AMALGAMATING MANY OVERLAPPING BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS

DAVID MILOVICH

Abstract. In general, two overlapping Boolean algebras always extend to a common Boolean algebra, but three may not. We prove a new sufficient condition for n overlapping Boolean algebras to have a common extension. Combining this with the set-theoretic technique of long ω_1-approximation sequences (also known as Davies sequences), we obtain a flexible method of constructing (in ZFC) arbitrarily large Boolean algebras as direct limits of countable Boolean algebras. Along the way, we develop some category theory regarding (co)limits of faces of commutative n-cubes and an n-ary version of the Interpolation Theorem of propositional logic.

Our main application of the above machinery is a Boolean algebra of size $\aleph_n$ with the n-ary FN but not the $(n+1)$-ary FN where the n-ary FN is a higher-arity variant of the Freese-Nation property. The Stone dual of the n-ary FN, n-open generation, generalizes Ščepin's concept of openly generated compact spaces.

We also show that, given a Boolean algebra A of size $\aleph_\alpha$ and letting $d = \min(\alpha+2, \omega)$, we have A projective iff it has every $(<d)$-ary FN iff it has a cofinal family of finite subalgebras whose $(<d)$-cube subdiagrams have a strong injectivity property. From this we deduce purely finitary consequences for the Vietoris hyperspace and symmetric power functors in the category of finite discrete spaces and finite functions.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Amalgamating overlapping Boolean algebras.** We say Boolean algebars $(A_i)_{i\in I}$ *overlap* if, for each $i, j \in I$, each Boolean operator of A_i, restricted to $A_i \cap A_j$, equals the corresponding restricted operator of A_j. (We consider 0 and 1 to be 0-ary operators.) Given two overlapping Boolean algebras or even an arbitrary Δ-system[1] of overlapping Boolean algebras, there is a Boolean algebra extending all of them called the amalgamated free product [7, 168–171].

However, if three overlapping Boolean algebras A, B, C do not form a Δ-system, then they may not have a common extension. Indeed, we might have $x <_A y <_B z <_C x$. This is a fundamental obstruction to constructing a Boolean algebra of size $\aleph_3$ or larger as direct limit of countable Boolean algebras. (See Theorem 3.1.8.) In Section 2, we prove a nontrivial sufficient condition for n overlapping Boolean

Date: July 28, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 06E05, 03E75. Secondary: 18A30, 54C55, 03B05.

Key words and phrases. Freese-Nation property, FN, openly generated, AE(0), free amalgamation, long ω_1-approximation sequence, Davies sequence, n-ary FN, commutative n-cube.

[1] Δ-systems are also known as sunflowers; they are characterized by $A_i \cap A_j = A_k \cap A_l$ for all i, j, k, l where $i \neq j$ and $k \neq l$.

algebras to have a common extension. (See Theorem 2.5.2.) We use this condition to prove Theorem 3.4.10, which provides a flexible way to construct (in ZFC) arbitrarily large Boolean algebras as direct limits of countable Boolean algebras.

The sufficient condition we find is not a necessary condition, and the problem of characterizing exactly when n overlapping finite Boolean algebras have a common extension is interesting from the point of view of complexity theory. (See Question 2.5.4.)

The workhorse of Section 2 is a generalization to n-tuples of Boolean subalgebras of the concept of commuting pairs of Boolean subalgebras from Heindorf and Shapiro's book [5].

Definition 1.1.1. Subalgebras A, B of C *commute* if, for all $(x, y) \in A \times B$, if $x \leq y$, then $x \leq z \leq y$ for some $z \in A \cap B$.

In Subsection 2.2, we use our n-ary concept to prove an n-ary version of the Interpolation Theorem of propositional logic.

Since the initial[2] extension of a family of overlapping Boolean algebras is the colimit of the diagram of all inclusions between finite intersections of these Boolean algebras, we must lay some category-theoretic groundwork concerning limits and colimits of commutative n-cubes in Subsections 2.1 and 2.3.

1.2. **Between AE(0) and openly generated.**

Definition 1.2.1.

- Let Bool denote the category of Boolean algebras and Boolean homomorphisms.
- Let Cpct_0 denote the category of Boolean spaces[3] and continuous functions.
- A Boolean space X is an *absolute extensor of dimension zero* or AE(0)[4] if it is an injective object in Cpct_0, or, more concretely, if for every Boolean space Y, closed $Z \subset Y$, and continuous $f\colon Z \to X$, there is a continuous $g\colon Y \to X$ extending f.

The AE(0) spaces form a robust and natural class with many characterizations. In particular, directly from the definition we see that AE(0) is preserved by finite sums, arbitrary products, and retracts. In particular, retracts of Cantor cubes are AE(0).[5] Conversely, thanks to the Tychonoff embedding, to each AE(0) space there is a homeomorphism from a closed subspace of a Cantor cube, which, by definition of AE(0), extends to a retract of that Cantor cube. Another point of interest is that Ščepin characterized the infinite Cantor cubes up to homeomorphism as the character-homogeneous infinite AE(0) spaces [17, Thm. 9].

For this paper, Haydon's characterization of AE(0) spaces is particularly useful.

Theorem 1.2.2 ([4])**.** *A Boolean space is AE(0) iff is it is the inverse limit of an ordinally indexed continuous inverse limit system* $((X_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}, (f_\alpha^\beta)_{\alpha<\beta<\eta})$ *such that each* $f_\alpha^{\alpha+1}\colon X_{\alpha+1} \to X_\alpha$ *is a continuous open surjection with cokernel* 2^ω*.*

Definition 1.2.3. Given continuous map $f\colon X \to Y$, a *cokernel* of f is space Z such that there is an embedding $e\colon X \to Y \times Z$ such that $f = \pi \circ e$ where $\pi\colon Y \times Z \to Y$ is the first coordinate projection.

[2] See Lemma 2.1.15.

[3] A space is Boolean iff it is compact, Hausdorff, and zero-dimensional.

[4] Most, but not all, instances of "Dugundji space" in the literature mean "AE(0) space."

[5] Hence, every metrizable Boolean space, being a retract of the Cantor set, is AE(0).

By Stone duality, the projective objects in the category Bool are exactly those algebras isomorphic to clopen algebras of AE(0) spaces. Hence, a Boolean algebra is projective iff it is a retract of a free Boolean algebra. The dual of Haydon's theorem is as follows.

Definition 1.2.4. A Boolean subalgebra A of a Boolean algebra B is *relatively complete*, or *rc*, if, for every principal ideal I of B, the set $I \cap A$ is a principal ideal of A. In this situation, we write $A \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$.

Theorem 1.2.5. *A Boolean algebra is projective iff it is the union of a transfinite continuous increasing chain of subalgebras $(A_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$ such that $A_0 = \{0,1\}$ and, for each $\alpha+1<\eta$, $A_\alpha \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_{\alpha+1}$ and $A_{\alpha+1}$ is generated by A_α and a countable set.*

Also useful to us will be the following modification by Koppelberg of the above theorem.

Definition 1.2.6. Given a subset S of a boolean algebra A, let $\langle S\rangle$ denote the Boolean closure of S.

Theorem 1.2.7 ([8, 2.8] (see also [5, 1.3.2]))**.** *A Boolean algebra is projective iff it is generated by the range of a transfinite sequence $(a_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$ such that, for all $\alpha+1<\eta$,*

$$\langle \{a_\beta \mid \beta<\alpha\}\rangle \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} \langle \{a_\beta \mid \beta<\alpha+1\}\rangle .$$

A weaker Boolean algebra property than projectivity is the *Freese-Nation property*, or FN, which asks of a Boolean algebra B that there exist a club $\mathcal{C}\subset [B]^{<\aleph_1}$ such that $A\leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$ for all $A\in\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 1.2.8. Given a set S and a cardinal κ, denote by $[S]^{<\kappa}$ the set of all $(<\kappa)$-sized subsets of S. We say that $\mathcal{C}\subset[S]^{<\kappa}$ is a *club* if κ is regular and uncountable and $\mathcal{C}$ is cofinal in the poset $([S]^{<\kappa},\subset)$ and closed with respect to unions of nonempty chains with fewer than κ elements.

To see that projective Boolean algebras indeed have the FN, we state a characterization of projectivity from [5]. This characterization is essentially the Stone Dual of a theorem of Ščepin [16, Thm. 26].

Theorem 1.2.9 ([5, Thm. 1.3.2])**.** *A Boolean algebra A is projective iff there is a sequence $(C_j)_{j\in J}$ of countable subalgebras of A such that $\left\langle \bigcup_{k\in K} C_k\right\rangle \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$ for all $K\subset J$ and $A=\bigcup_{j\in J} C_j$.*

Given $\vec{C}$ as above, the FN is witnessed by the following club.

$$\left\{ \left\langle \bigcup_{j\in K} C_j \right\rangle \;\middle|\; K\in[J]^{<\aleph_1} \right\}$$

Actually, Freese and Nation [2] originally defined the FN as the existence of a map f from a lattice L to the finite subsets of L such that $f(x)\cap f(y)\cap[x,y]$ is nonempty whenever $[x,y]$ is. (Their motivation was to charactize projective lattices.) Their definition makes sense for all posets, as does the concept of relative completeness, provided we also require that principal filters restrict to principal filters, something that is redundant in the Boolean case. For a proof that these two definitions of the FN are equivalent for all posets, see [3], which studies higher-cardinal variants, the κ-FN for infinite κ, or [11], which studies two-cardinal variants, the (λ,κ)-FN for

infinite $\lambda \geq \kappa$. Each of these variants, including the original FN, is preserved by retracts and coproducts in the category of Boolean algebras. [11]

The important case of the $\aleph_1$-FN was first introduced and studied in the Boolean case in [5, 4.2] as the weak FN, or WFN. In [3], it is shown consistent with ZFC that every Cohen algebra has the WFN. For our purposes, the most interesting characterization of the WFN is the following from Heindorf and Shapiro's book.

Theorem 1.2.10 ([5, Thm 4.2.3])**.** *A Boolean algebra A has the WFN iff there exists a club $\mathcal{C} \subset [A]^{<\aleph_1}$ such that all pairs $F, G \in \mathcal{C}$ are commuting subalgebras of A.*

Using the above theorem, we can easily see that the FN implies the WFN: if $f\colon A \to [A]^{<\aleph_0}$ witnesses the FN, then the club $\mathcal{C}$ of f-closed countable subsets of of A witnesses the WFN.

Theorem 3.3.12 generalizes Theorem 1.2.10 to the λ-FN for all regular uncountable λ, and gives two additional characterizations respectively involving "large" and "small" elementary substructures.

The FN is shown in [5] to be the Stone Dual of Ščepin's concepts of *open generation* and *kappa-metrizability*, which Ščepin proved equivalent for all compact Hausdorff spaces. [16] Kappa-metrizability concerns a distance fuction between points and regular closed sets. We find open generation easier to work with and easier to generalize.

Definition 1.2.11. Given a Tychonoff space X:

- $C(X)$ is the set of all continuous $f\colon X \to \mathbb{R}$.
- Given a set F, let X/F denote the quotient space induced by declaring $x \sim y$ iff $f(x) = f(y)$ for all $f \in C(X) \cap F$. Let q_F^X denote the corresponding quotient map $X \to X/F$.
- X is *openly generated* if there is a club $\mathcal{D} \subset [C(X)]^{<\aleph_1}$ such that q_F^X is open for all $F \in \mathcal{D}$.[6]

Using the Tychonoff embedding $e\colon X \to \mathbb{R}^{C(X)}$ where $e(x)(f) = f(x)$, we see that every quotient of the form X/F is Tychonoff.

Example 1.2.12. Every separable metric space[7] is trivially openly generated, but the ordered space $\omega_1 + 1$ is not. To see this, suppose we have a club $\mathcal{D} \subset [C(\omega_1 + 1)]^{<\aleph_1}$. Choose an increasing chain $F_n \in \mathcal{D}$ for $n < \omega$ such that F_0 separates 0 and ω_1 and each F_{n+1} separates the pair of intervals $[0, \alpha + 1]$ and $[\alpha + 2, \omega_1]$ for each α separated from ω_1 by F_n. Letting $G = \bigcup \vec{F}$, there will be a least ordinal $\delta < \omega_1$ not separated from ω_1 by G, and δ will be a limit ordinal. Therefore, $q_G^{\omega_1+1}$ will map the open set $[\delta + 1, \omega_1]$ onto a non-isolated singleton.

For much more about openly generated compact spaces, we refer the reader to Ščepin's papers [15, 16, 17]. We mention in passing that among compact Hausdorff spaces, open generation is preserved by (continuous) retracts, (arbitrary) products, finite sums, the Vietoris hyperspace operation, symmetric powers, passing to closed

[6] Ščepin [16, Def. 4] defines the class of openly generated compact Hausdorff spaces as the class of all inverse limits $\lim((X_p)_{p\in P}, (f_p^q)_{p\leq q})$ where each X_p is a second countable compact Hausdorff space, each $f_p^q\colon X_q \to X_p$ is an open quotient map, and $(P, \leq)$ is a poset such that every countable chain has a supremum. Thanks to the Tychonoff embedding $e\colon X \to \mathbb{R}^{C(X)}$ where $e(x)(f) = f(x)$, our formulation is consistent with Ščepin's.

[7] Equivalently, second countable Tychonoff space.

G_δ subsets, and continuous open images. Furthermore, continuous images of openly generated spaces are like dyadic spaces in that they are ccc and satisfy equality of π-character and weight.[8] Yet, not all openly generated spaces are dyadic [14].

Corollary 4.1.5 characterizes the AE(0) spaces in terms of finite $\in$-chains of elementary substructures. Also in Subsection 4.1, we prove Theorem 1.2.14, which characterizes AE(0) in terms of a new heirarchy of topological properties, d-open generation for $d \leq \omega$. The proofs of both of these characterizations use the set-theoretic technique of long ω_1-approximation sequences, also known as Davies sequences, which are defined in Subsection 3.2.

Definition 1.2.13.

- A Tychonoff space X is *d-openly generated* if there is a club $\mathcal{E} \subset [C(X)]^{<\aleph_1}$ such that q_F^X is open for every F that is a union of fewer than d-many elements of $\mathcal{E}$.
- Dually, a Boolean algebra A has the d-ary FN, or FN_d, if there is a club $\mathcal{E} \subset [A]^{<\aleph_1}$ such that $B \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$ for every subalgebra B generated by a union of fewer than d-many elements of $\mathcal{E}$.

In Subsection 3.1, we will show that retracts and products preserve d-open generation of Tychonoff spaces.[9]

Every space is trivially 1-openly generated, but 2-open generation is equivalent to open generation, which Ščepin proved equivalent to AE(0) for Boolean spaces of weight $\leq \aleph_1$ and strictly weaker than AE(0) for Boolean spaces of weight $\geq \aleph_2$. [15] The following theorem generalizes Ščepin's result.

Theorem 1.2.14.

- *If $1 \leq d < \omega$, then d-open generation is equivalent to AE(0) for Boolean spaces of weight $< \aleph_d$.*
- *AE(0) is equivalent to ω-open generation.*

In Subsection 4.2, using both Davies sequences and our Boolean amalgamation results, we show that our hierarchy of Freese-Nation variants is strict.

Theorem 1.2.15. *For each $d \in [1, \omega)$, there is a Boolean algebra of size $\aleph_d$ with the d-ary FN but not the $(d+1)$-ary FN.*

Corollary 1.2.16. *For each $d \in [1, \omega)$, d-open generation is strictly weaker than $(d+1)$-open generation.*

Curiously, the following natural problem remains open.

Problem 1.2.17. Given $3 \leq d < \omega$, find a characterization of the FN_d analogous to Freese and Nation's formulation of the FN.

As shown below, a natural d-ary analog of Freese and Nation's formulation implies the FN_d.

---

[8] The weight of a space X is the maximum of $\aleph_0$ and the least size of a topological base of X; the π-character of X is the supremum over all $p \in X$ of the maximum of $\aleph_0$ and the least size of a local π-base at p.

[9] Finite sums obviously also preserve d-open generation.

Theorem 1.2.18. *Suppose that $d < \omega$, A is a boolean algebra, and $f\colon A \to [A]^{<\aleph_0}$ is such that, for each $n \leq d$ and $\vec{x} \in A^n$ satisfying $\bigwedge \vec{x} = 0$, there exists*

$$\vec{y} \in \prod_{i<n} \left(\langle f(x_i) \rangle \cap \left\langle \bigcup_{j \neq i} f(x_j) \right\rangle \right)$$

such that $\bigwedge \vec{y} = 0$ and $x_i \leq y_i$. Then A has the FN_d.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the club of all countable f-closed subsets of A. Given $n < d$ and $C_0, \dots, C_{n-1} \in \mathcal{C}$, let $B = \left\langle \bigcup_{i<n} C_i \right\rangle$. Given $x \in A$, let $D = \langle f(x) \rangle \cap B$, which is finite. Given $x \geq y \in B$, it suffices to find $w \in D$ such that $x \geq w \geq y$. Let $y = \bigvee_{k<m} \bigwedge_{i<n} y_{k,i}$ where $y_{k,i} \in C_i$. For each $k < m$, let $y_{k,n} = -x$. By hypothesis, there exist $z_{k,i}$ for $k < m$ and $i \leq n$ such that $y_{k,i} \leq z_{k,i}$, $z_{k,i} \in \langle f(y_{k,i}) \rangle \cap \left\langle \bigcup_{j \neq i} f(y_{k,j}) \right\rangle$, and $\bigwedge_{i \leq n} z_{k,i} = 0$. Then $w = -\bigwedge_{k<m} z_{k,n}$ is as desired. □

However, for $d \geq 3$, we only know how to prove the partial converse (see Corollary 5.1.10) that the d-ary strong FN (see Definiton 1.3.2) implies the existence of f as above.

For additional background information about projective Boolean algebras, we recommend [5, Ch. 1] or [8]; for the Freese-Nation property, we recommend [5, Ch. 2,3].

1.3. **Finitary predictions.** In Subsection 5.2, as a corollary of the equivalence of AE(0) and 3-open generation for Boolean spaces of weight $\aleph_2$, we obtain that the Vietoris hyperspace operator Exp and the nontrivial symmetric power operators SP^n do not preserve 3-open generation, in contrast to Ščepin's results in [15] showing that they do preserve open generation. Combining this result with a characterization (Corollary 5.1.8) of AE(0) spaces in terms of inverse limits of finite discrete spaces, we deduce purely finitary consequences from facts about Boolean algebras of size $\aleph_2$. We show, very non-constructively (see Corollary 5.2.7), that for each of the functors Exp, SP^2, SP^3, SP^4,..., there is a commutative cube of 8 finite discrete spaces and 12 finite functions that is 3-commutative (see Definition 2.3.1) but loses its 3-commutativity when the functor is applied.

We obtain our characterization of AE(0) spaces in terms of inverse limits of finite discrete spaces by characterizing the projective Boolean algebras in terms of cofinal families of finite subalgebras. This characterization involves higher-arity variants of Heindorf and Shapiro's *strong Freese-Nation property*.

Definition 1.3.1 ([5, 4.3.1])**.** A Boolean algebra A has the *strong Freese-Nation property*, or SFN, if it has a cofinal family $\mathcal{D}$ of finite subalgebras such that each pair $B, C \in \mathcal{D}$ commutes.

Heindorf and Shapiro used Theorem 1.2.7 to prove that projectivity implies the SFN [5, 4.3.2-3] and observed that the SFN clearly implies Freese and Nation's formulation of the FN. They left open whether the SFN strictly implies the FN, but in [12], the author constructed a Boolean algebra of size $\aleph_2$ with the FN but not the SFN. That construction used Davies sequences and amalgamation of pairs of Boolean algebras.

Definition 1.3.2. Given $d \leq \omega$, a Boolean algebra A has the *d-ary SFN*, or SFN_d, if it has a cofinal family $\mathcal{E}$ of finite subalgebras such that each tuple $B_0, \dots, B_{n-1} \in \mathcal{E}$ of length less than $1 + d$ commutes. (See Definition 2.1.21.)

The binary SFN is just the SFN. In Section 5, we prove the SFN_d is preserved by coproducts and retracts. More importantly, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3.3. *For each $d \in [1, \omega]$, projectivity implies the d-ary SFN implies the d-ary FN.*

Though generalizing from the SFN to the SFN_d introduces significant complications, the fundamental step in our deduction of the SFN_d from projectivity is still Theorem 1.2.7. Since we have not solved Problem 1.2.17, deducing the FN_d from the SFN_d for $d \geq 3$ actually requires an argument, though not a long one.

Corollary 1.3.4.

- *A Boolean algebra is projective iff it has the ω-ary SFN iff it has the ω-ary FN.*
- *For each $d \in [1, \omega)$, a Boolean algebra of size $< \aleph_d$ is projective is iff it has the d-ary SFN.*

Since, for example, the exponential [14] and nontrivial symmetric copowers [16] of the free Boolean algebra of size $\aleph_2$ are not projective,[10] if $\mathcal{E}$ is a cofinal family of finite subalgebras of an $\aleph_2$-sized free Boolean algebras that witnesses the ω-ary SFN,[11] then each of the exponential and nontrivial symmetric copower functors destroys the commutativity of some triple $A, B, C \in \mathcal{E}$. In contrast, the commutativity of the pairs are preserved [5, Lem. 4.3.3, 4.3.5]. Hence, as observed in [5], the exponential and symmetric cosquare of the free Boolean algebra of size $\aleph_2$ have the SFN but are not projective. See [16] for many more topologically formulated examples of functors that destroy the projectivity of the $\aleph_2$-sized free Boolean algebra yet preserve the finiteness of finite Boolean algebras. Every such functor destroys the commutativity of some triple $A, B, C \in \mathcal{E}$.

Section 5 raises some questions because it does not separate, for example, the ternary SFN from the ternary FN. In fact, it does not even separate the ternary SFN from projectivity.

Question 1.3.5. For $d \in [3, \omega)$, is the d-ary SFN strictly stronger than the d-ary FN, and is it strictly weaker than the $(d+1)$-ary SFN?

We know that at least one of the two implications in $\mathrm{SFN}_\omega \Rightarrow \mathrm{SFN}_3 \Rightarrow \mathrm{FN}_3$ must be strict, but we do not have a proof that any particular one is strict. First, we do not know if the Boolean algebra constructed in this paper to have the FN_3 but not the FN_4 also has SFN_3. Second, generalizing the construction separating the SFN_2 and FN_2 at size $\aleph_2$ in [12] from 2 to d would require at minimum a solution to Problem 1.2.17.

2. Free amalgamation of n Boolean algebras

2.1. **n-ary pushouts and pullbacks.** In category theory, a span (cospan) is a commutative square with a missing corner that a pushout (pullback) fills in in the nicest possible way. Analogously, in our definition below, an n-ary span (n-ary cospan) is a commutative n-cube with a missing corner that our generalized pushout (pullback) fills in in the nicest possible way.

[10] The exponential and symmetric copower functors are the respective Stone duals of the Vietoris hyperspace and symmetric power functors.

[11] For example, given an independent generating set G, take $\mathcal{E}$ to be the set of subalgebras generated by finite subsets of G.

Definition 2.1.1.

- Let $\mathcal{P}_+(x) = \mathcal{P}(x) \setminus \{\varnothing\}$.
- By an *n-ary span* (*n-ary cospan*) we mean a functor from the poset category $(\mathcal{P}_+(n), \supset)$ $((\mathcal{P}_+(n), \subset))$ to a category in which every finite diagram has a colimit (limit).
- By a *pushout* (*pullback*) we mean a colimit (limit) of a span (cospan).
- Given an n-ary cospan $(f_t^s \colon X_s \to X_t \mid \varnothing \neq s \subset t \subset n)$, denote an arbitrary pullback of $(\vec{X}, \vec{f})$ by an object $\boxtimes \vec{X}$ along with a sequence of *projections* $\boxtimes_s \colon \boxtimes \vec{X} \to X_s$ for $s \in \mathcal{P}_+(n)$. Given also morphisms $g_s \colon Y \to X_s$ for $s \in \mathcal{P}_+(n)$ such that $g_t = f_t^s \circ g_s$, let the *mediating morphism* $\boxtimes \vec{g}$ denote the unique morphism $u \colon Y \to \boxtimes \vec{X}$ for which $\boxtimes_s \circ u = g_s$.
- Given an n-ary span $(f_t^s \colon X_t \to X_s \mid \varnothing \neq s \subset t \subset n)$, denote an arbitrary pushout of $(\vec{X}, \vec{f})$ by an object $\boxplus \vec{X}$ along with a sequence of *coprojections* $\boxplus_s \colon X_s \to \boxplus \vec{X}$ for $s \in \mathcal{P}_+(n)$. Given also morphisms $g_s \colon X_s \to Y$ for $s \in \mathcal{P}_+(n)$ such that $g_t = g_s \circ f_t^s$, let the *mediating morphism* $\boxplus \vec{g}$ denote the unique morphism $u \colon \boxplus \vec{X} \to Y$ for which $u \circ \boxplus_s = g_s$.

Since pushouts and pullbacks are unique only up to isomorphism, it is convenient and instructive to select as canonical simple instances of them in a few concrete categories.

Definition 2.1.2. We name some categories as follows.

Category	Objects	Morphisms
Set	sets	functions
Fin	finite sets	functions
Cpct_0	Boolean spaces	continuous functions
Bool	Boolean algebras	Boolean homomorphisms

We adopt the following implementation of Stone duality.

- $\mathrm{Clop} \colon \mathrm{Cpct}_0 \to \mathrm{Bool}^{\mathrm{op}}$ is a functor.
- $\mathrm{Clop}(X)$ is the algebra of clopen subsets of X.
- $\mathrm{Clop}(f \colon X \to Y)(E) = f^{-1}[E]$.
- $\mathrm{Ult} \colon \mathrm{Bool} \to \mathrm{Cpct}_0^{\mathrm{op}}$ is a functor.
- $\mathrm{Ult}(A)$ is the set of ultrafilters of A with the topology generated by $\{Ult_A(a) \mid a \in A\}$ where $Ult_A(a) = \{U \in \mathrm{Ult}(A) \mid a \in U\}$.
- $\mathrm{Ult}(h \colon A \to B)(U) = h^{-1}[U]$.

In each of the above categories, all finite diagrams have limits and colimits. Also, $\mathrm{Fin} = \mathrm{Set} \cap \mathrm{Cpct}_0$ modulo giving each finite set the discrete topology.

Definition 2.1.3. In the category Cpct_0, given an n-ary cospan

$$(f_t^s \colon X_s \to X_t \mid \varnothing \neq s \subset t \subset n),$$

define its *canonical pullback* by

$$\boxtimes \vec{X} = \left\{ x \in \prod_{i<n} X_{\{i\}} \;\middle|\; \forall (i < j < n)\ f_{\{i,j\}}^{\{i\}}(x(i)) = f_{\{i,j\}}^{\{j\}}(x(j)) \right\}$$

and $\boxtimes_s(x) = f_s^{\{i\}}(x(i))$ for $i \in s \subset n$. (This definition also works for Set and Fin.)

Exercise 2.1.4. The above canonical pullback is indeed a pullback. That is, given morphisms $g_s \colon Y \to X_s$ for $s \in \mathcal{P}_+(n)$ such that $g_t = f_t^s \circ g_s$, there is a unique morphism $\boxtimes \vec{g} \colon Y \to \boxtimes \vec{X}$ such that $\boxtimes_s \circ \boxtimes \vec{g} = g_s$.

Unfortunately, for $n > 2$, "nicest possible" isn't always very nice. For example, there is a ternary cospan of surjections between finite nonempty sets whose pullback object is the empty set: let $X_3 = 1$, $X_s = 2$ for other $s \in \mathcal{P}_+(3)$, $f^{\{0\}}_{\{0,1\}}(x) = 1 - x$ for $x \in 2$, and $f^{\{i\}}_{\{i,j\}} = \mathrm{id}$ for other $i, j < 3$. By Stone duality, there is likewise a ternary cospan of embeddings between nondegenerate finite Boolean algebras whose pushout object is the degenerate Boolean algebra. Worse for our purposes, three overlapping Boolean algebras may not extend to a common Boolean algebra, as shown formally in the Example 2.1.18 below.

Definition 2.1.5. Say that a sequence $(F_i)_{i\in I}$ of subalgebras of a fixed Boolean algebra G is *independent* if, for all finite $J \subseteq I$ and all $\vec{x} \in \prod_{j\in J} F_j$, if $\bigwedge \vec{x} = 0$, then $x_j = 0$ for some $j \in J$.

Observation 2.1.6.

- *$\vec{F}$ is independent iff, for every $\vec{U} \in \prod_{i\in I} \mathrm{Ult}(F_i)$, some $V \in \mathrm{Ult}(G)$ extends $\bigcup \vec{U}$.*
- *If (F_i, F_j) is independent, then $F_i \cap F_j = \{0, 1\}$.*

Definition 2.1.7.

- A *Boolean embedding* is an injective Boolean homomorphism.
- Given Boolean algebras A_i for $i \in I$, a *coproduct* (also known as a free product) is a Boolean algebra $\bigoplus \vec{A}$ together with *cofactor maps* $\oplus_i A_i \to A$ such that each $\oplus_i$ is a Boolean embedding, $(\oplus_i[A_i])_{i\in I}$ is independent, and $\bigcup_{i\in I} \oplus_i[A_i]$ generates $\bigoplus \vec{A}$. When $I = 2$, we write $A_0 \oplus A_1$ for $\bigoplus \vec{A}$.[12]
- Given also morphisms $g_i \colon A_i \to B$ for $i \in I$, let the *mediating morphism* $\bigoplus \vec{g}$ denote the unique morphism $u \colon \bigoplus \vec{A} \to B$ for which $u \circ \oplus_i = g_i$.

Definition 2.1.8. Given objects F, G in a concrete category $\mathcal{C}$, by $\mathrm{id} \colon F \to G$ we mean the unique morphism $h \colon F \to G$, if it exists, satisfying $h(x) = x$ for all $x \in F$. We call $\mathrm{id} \colon F \to G$ as above an *inclusion*.

Observation 2.1.9. *If $\vec{A}$ is a sequence of overlapping Boolean algebras and $A_i \cap A_j = \{0, 1\}$ for all $i \neq j$, then there is a coproduct $\bigoplus \vec{A}$ such that $\oplus_i[A_i] = \mathrm{id} \colon A_i \to \bigoplus \vec{A}$.*

Definition 2.1.10.

- Given Boolean algebras A and B, we write $A \leq B$ to indicate that A is a subalgebra of B.
- Given $A_0, \ldots, A_{n-1}, B \leq C$, by $B = \bigoplus \vec{A}$ we mean that $B = \left\langle \bigcup \vec{A} \right\rangle$ and $\vec{A}$ is independent in C.

Definition 2.1.11.

- A *quotient* of a Boolean algebra A with respect to an ideal I is a Boolean algebra B together with a surjective homomorphism $f \colon A \to B$ with kernel I; f is called the *quotient map* and $f(x)$ will be denoted by x/I when there is no ambiguity.
- Given also a Boolean embedding $e \colon C \to A$, we say that (B, f) is *e-canonical* if $f \circ e$ extends $\mathrm{id} \colon C \to C$.

[12] The above definition of coproduct agrees with the one from category theory. See [7, 158–168].

Observation 2.1.12. *If I an ideal of Boolean algebra A, $e_i\colon C_i \to A$ for $i < n$ are Boolean embeddings, $0_{C_i} = 0_{C_j}$ for all i, j, $e_i^{-1}[I] = \{0\}$ for all i, and $(\operatorname{ran}(e_i))_{i<n}$ is independent, then there is a quotient (B, f) that is e_i-canonical for all i because from the algebra of I-equivalence classes of A we can induce a Boolean isomorphism by replacing each class K intersecting $\bigcup_{i<n} \operatorname{ran}(e_i)$ with the unique element of $\bigcup_{i<n} e_i^{-1}[K]$.*

Definition 2.1.13.

- In the category Bool, given an n-ary span,
$$(h_t^s\colon A_t \to A_s \mid \varnothing \neq s \subset t \subset n)$$
a *canonical pushout* is a quotient of $\bigoplus_{i<n} A_{\{i\}}$ with respect to the ideal I generated by all well-defined terms of the form $h_{\{i,j\}}^{\{i\}}(x) \wedge h_{\{i,j\}}^{\{j\}}(-x)$, together with maps given by $\boxplus_s(x) = h_s^{\{i\}}(x)/I$; additionally require that the quotient be $\oplus_i$-canonical for all i where $\oplus_i^{-1}[I] = \{0_{A_{\{0\}}}\}$.
- Given overlapping Boolean algebras A_i for $i < n$, define a *pushout* $\boxplus \vec{A}$ of $\vec{A}$ to be a canonical pushout $\boxplus \vec{B}$ of the inclusions $B_t \to B_s$ for $\varnothing \neq s \subset t \subset n$ where $B_t = \bigcap_{i\in t} A_i$. In this context, $\boxplus_i$ denotes the coprojection $\boxplus_{\{i\}}\colon B_{\{i\}} \to B$. For $n = 2$, let $A_0 \boxplus A_1 = \boxplus \vec{A}$.

Exercise 2.1.14. The above canonical pushout is indeed a pushout. That is, given morphisms $g_s\colon A_s \to B$ for $s \in \mathcal{P}_+(n)$ such that $g_t = g_s \circ h_t^s$, there is a unique morphism $\boxplus \vec{g}\colon \boxplus \vec{A} \to B$ such that $\boxplus \vec{g} \circ \boxplus_s = g_s$.

Lemma 2.1.15. *If $A_i \leq B$ for $i < n$, then $\boxplus_i(x) = x$ for all $i < n$ and $x \in A_i$, and the inclusions $A_i \to B$ have a unique common extension $u\colon \boxplus \vec{A} \to B$.*

Proof. Let $u\colon \boxplus \vec{A} \to B$ be the mediating morphism of the inclusions $A_i \to B$. Then $u \circ \boxplus_i = \mathrm{id}\colon A_i \to B$. By definition of canonical pushout, $\boxplus_i = \mathrm{id}\colon A_i \to \boxplus \vec{A}$. Hence, $u \supset \mathrm{id}\colon A_i \to B$. Moreover, any common extension $u'\colon \boxplus \vec{A} \to B$ of the maps $\mathrm{id}\colon A_i \to B$ would also be a mediating morphism of these maps, and so would be u. □

Corollary 2.1.16. *If $A_0, \ldots, A_{n-1}$ are overlapping Boolean algebras, then they have a common extension iff the coprojections $\boxplus_i\colon A_i \to \boxplus \vec{A}$ are all injective.*

From the point of view of category theory, the above lemma and corollary are just a special case of something very easy and very general: if a diagram F has a colimit object C, then, for each cocone $(\psi_A\colon F(A) \to B)_A$ of F and each of its morphisms ψ_A, if ψ_A is monic, then the corresponding coprojection $\boxplus_A\colon F(A) \to C$ is also monic because it is a right factor of ψ_A.

Definition 2.1.17. Say that a sequence $(x_i)_{i\in I}$ of elements of a fixed Boolean algebra is *independent* if $(\{x_i, -x_i, 0, 1\})_{i\in I}$ is independent. Say that a Boolean algebra F is *freely generated* by $(x_i)_{i\in I}$ if $F = \langle\{x_i \mid i \in I\}\rangle$ and $(x_i)_{i\in I}$ is independent. Say that Boolean algebra is *free* if it is freely generated by some sequence.

Example 2.1.18. There are overlapping Boolean algebras A_0, A_1, A_2 such that $|A_i| = 2^3$ for all $i < 3$ yet $|\boxplus \vec{A}| = 2^1$. To obtain them, arrange that A_i is generated by $x_i, x_{i+_3 1}$ where $+_3$ is addition modulo 3, that $A_i \cap A_{i+_3 1}$ is freely generated by $x_{i+_3 1}$, and that $0 < x_0 < x_1 < 1$ in A_0, $0 < x_1 < x_2 < 1$ in A_1, and $0 < x_2 < -x_0 < 1$ in A_2.

On the other hand, a Δ-system of overlapping Boolean algebras always extends to a common Boolean algebra. Indeed, given a diagram of Boolean embeddings of the form $(h_j\colon A \to B_j)_{j\in J}$, the coprojections of its colimit are also Boolean embeddings. See Koppelberg [7, 168–71] for details; the above colimit is there called an amalgamated free product. For future reference, we state the two-algebra case below.

Lemma 2.1.19. *Given a span of Boolean embeddings $A \hookleftarrow C \hookrightarrow B$, the pushout D has injective coprojections $A \hookrightarrow D \hookleftarrow B$.*

In order to find a common extension of overlapping Boolean algebras A, B, C, it turns out to be helpful for the unique map $u\colon (A\cap C)\boxplus(B\cap C)\to C$ extending $\mathrm{id}\colon A\cap C\to C$ and $\mathrm{id}\colon B\cap C\to C$ to be injective.

Example 2.1.20. In the statement of Lemma 2.1.15, the map u may not be injective. For a minimal example, let $B=\mathcal{P}(3)$ and $A_i=\langle\{i\}\rangle$ for $i<2$. Since $A_0\cap A_1=\{\varnothing,3\}$, we have $A_0\boxplus A_1\cong A_0\oplus A_1$. Therefore, $\boxplus\vec{A}$ has four atoms while B has only three.

Definition 2.1.21. Given Boolean subalgebras $A_i\le B$ for $i<n$:

- We say that $\vec{A}$ *commutes* and write $\bigdownarrow\vec{A}$ if the unique common extension $\boxplus\vec{A}\to B$ of the inclusions $A_i\to B$ is injective. For $n=2$, we write $A_0\downarrow A_1$ for $\bigdownarrow\vec{A}$.
- By $C=\boxplus\vec{A}$ we mean that $C=\left\langle\bigcup\vec{A}\right\rangle$ and $\bigdownarrow\vec{A}$ in B.

Definition 2.1.21 is compatible with Definition 1.1.1. This follows from [7, 11.22 (p. 171)] and also from Lemma 2.2.6. For definiteness, our official definition of commuting pairs of subalgebras is henceforth Definition 2.1.21 with $n=2$.

Observation 2.1.22.

- *If $A_i\le B$ and $\bigdownarrow\vec{A}$, then we may choose $\boxplus\vec{A}$ such that $A_i\le\boxplus\vec{A}\le B$.*
- *If $\bigdownarrow(A_i)_{i<n}$, then $\bigdownarrow_{i<n}\boxplus_i[A_i]$ and $\boxplus\vec{A}=\langle\bigcup_{i<n}\boxplus_i[A_i]\rangle$.*
- *If $A_0,\dots,A_{n-1}\le B$ are independent, then $\bigdownarrow\vec{A}$ and $\boxplus\vec{A}\cong\bigoplus\vec{A}$.*
- *If $A_i\le B$ for all $i<n$ and $A_i\cap A_j=\{0,1\}$ for all $i<j<n$, then $\vec{A}$ commutes iff $\vec{A}$ is independent.*

2.2. **An n-ary Interpolation Theorem.** In propositional logic, the Interpolation Theorem says that every tautological implication $\varphi\vdash\psi$ factors as $\varphi\vdash\chi\vdash\psi$ where the variables of χ are common to φ and ψ. In this subsection we prove an internal characterization of commuting sequences of subalgebras and apply it prove an n-ary version of the Interpolation Theorem. This characterization will also be useful in Subsection 3.4.

Definition 2.2.1. Given $A_i\le B$ for $i<n$, we say that $\vec{A}$ *weakly commutes* and write $\overset{\circ}{\downarrow}\vec{A}$ if, for each $\vec{x}\in\prod\vec{A}$ satisfying $\bigwedge\vec{x}=0$, there exists $(y_i)_{i<n}$ such that $\bigwedge\vec{y}=0$ and $x_i\le y_i\in\left\langle A_i\cap\bigcup_{j\neq i}A_j\right\rangle$ for $i<n$. Given $\vec{A}$ and $\vec{x}$ as above, we call any $\vec{y}$ as above a *weak incompatibility witness* for $\vec{x}$.

First, we justify "weakly."

Definition 2.2.2. Given x in a Boolean algebra A and $k<\omega$, by $(-1)^k x$ we mean x if k is even else $-x$.

Definition 2.2.3. Given overlapping algebras $A_0, \dots, A_{n-1}$ and $\vec{x} \in \prod \vec{A}$, an *incompatibility witness* for $\vec{x}$ is a triple $(\vec{z}, t, s)$ such that $t\colon m \times 2 \to n$ where $m = \mathrm{dom}(\vec{z})$, $t(k,0) < t(k,1)$, $z_k \in \bigcap_{e<2} A_{t(k,e)}$, $s\colon {}^m2 \to n$, and

$$x_i \leq \bigwedge_{s(f)=i} \bigvee_{t(k,f(k))=i} (-1)^{f(k)} z_k.$$

Lemma 2.2.4 (Witnessing)**.** *Given overlapping Boolean algebras $A_0, \dots, A_{n-1}$ and $\vec{x} \in \prod \vec{A}$, we have $\bigwedge_{i<n} \boxplus_i(x_i) = 0$ iff $\vec{x}$ has an incompatibility witness. If also $A_i \leq B$ for all i and $\vec{x}$ has an incompatibility witness, then $\vec{x}$ has a weak incompatibility witness.*

Proof. First, suppose $\bigwedge_{i<n} \boxplus_i(x_i) = 0$. Then $\bigwedge_{i<n} \oplus_i(x_i)$ is in the ideal from Definition 2.1.13. Hence, there exist $m < \omega$ and, for each $k < m$, $t(k,0) < t(k,1) < n$ and $z_k \in \bigcap_{e<2} A_{t(k,e)}$ such that

$$\bigwedge_{i<n} \oplus_i(x_i) \leq \bigvee_{k<m} \left(\oplus_{t(k,0)}(z_k) \wedge \oplus_{t(k,1)}(-z_k)\right).$$

Hence, for each $f\colon m \to 2$,

$$\bigwedge_{i<n} \oplus_i(x_i) \leq \bigvee_{k<m} \oplus_{t(k,f(k))}\left((-1)^{f(k)} z_k\right) = \bigvee_{i<n} \oplus_i \left(\bigvee_{t(k,f(k))=i} (-1)^{f(k)} z_k \right).$$

For each f, since $(\oplus_i[A_i])_{i<n}$ is independent, we have, for some $s(f) < n$,

$$x_{s(f)} \leq \bigvee_{t(k,f(k))=s(f)} (-1)^{f(k)} z_k.$$

Therefore, for each $i < n$, we have $x_i \leq y_i$ where

$$y_i = \bigwedge_{s(f)=i} \bigvee_{t(k,f(k))=i} (-1)^{f(k)} z_k.$$

Thus, $((z_k)_{k<m}, t, s)$ is an incompatibility witness for $\vec{x}$.

Conversely, suppose $((z_k)_{k<m}, t, s)$ is an incompatibility witness for $\vec{x}$. It suffices to show that $\vec{x}$ has a weak incompatibility witness, assuming $A_i \leq B$ for all i, and to show that $\bigwedge_{i<n} \boxplus_i(x_i) = 0$. Defining $\vec{y}$ as above, we have $x_i \leq y_i \in \left\langle A_i \cap \bigcup_{j\neq i} A_j \right\rangle$. Moreover,

$$\bigwedge \vec{y} \leq \bigwedge_{i<n} \bigwedge_{s(f)=i} \bigvee_{k<m} (-1)^{f(k)} z_k = \bigwedge_{f\colon m\to 2} \bigvee_{k<m} (-1)^{f(k)} z_k = \bigvee_{k<m} (z_k \wedge -z_k) = 0.$$

Thus, $\vec{y}$ is a weak incompatibility witness for $\vec{x}$. Also, $\bigwedge_{i<n} \boxplus_i(x_i) = 0$ by the following computation.

$$\begin{aligned}
\bigwedge_{i<n} \oplus_i(x_i) &\leq \bigwedge_{f\in {}^m2} \oplus_{s(f)}(x_{s(f)}) \\
&\leq \bigwedge_{f\in {}^m2} \bigvee_{t(k,f(k))=s(f)} (-1)^{f(k)} \oplus_{s(f)}(z_k) \\
&\leq \bigwedge_{f\in {}^m2} \bigvee_{k<m} (-1)^{f(k)} \oplus_{t(k,f(k))}(z_k) \\
&= \bigvee_{k<m} (\oplus_{t(k,0)}(z_k) \wedge \oplus_{t(k,1)}(-z_k))
\end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 2.2.5. Given x, y in a Boolean algebra A, by $x \perp y$ we mean $x \wedge y = 0$.

Lemma 2.2.6 (Interpolation)**.** *Given $A, B \leq C$, the following are equivalent.*

(1) $A \bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow B$.
(2) *If $A \ni x \perp y \in B$, then there exists $z \in A \cap B$ such that $x \leq z \perp y$.*
(3) *If $A \ni x \leq y \in B$, then $[x, y] \cap A \cap B \neq \varnothing$.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Assume (1) and $A \ni x \perp y \in B$. By Witnessing (2.2.4), there exist $z, w \in A \cap B$ such that $x \leq z \perp w \geq y$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Define $h\colon A \oplus B \to C$ by $h(\oplus_i(x)) = x$. Assuming (2), it suffices to show that $\ker(h)$ is the ideal I generated by $\oplus_0(z) \wedge \oplus_1(-z)$ for $z \in A \cap B$. Clearly, $I \subset \ker(h)$. For the converse, suppose $h(w) = 0$. Then w is a join of terms of the form $v = \oplus_0(x) \wedge \oplus_1(y)$. For each such v, since it is in $\ker(h)$, we have $x \wedge y = 0$. By (2), $x \leq z$ and $y \leq -z$ for some $z \in A \cap B$. Hence, $v \in I$. Thus, $w \in I$.

(2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3): $x \leq y \Leftrightarrow x \perp -y$ and $z \leq y \Leftrightarrow z \perp -y$. □

Koppelberg [7, 11.22 (p. 171)] does not explicitly define commuting pairs of subalgebras, but does prove (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2). In Chapter 4 of [5], Heindorf and Shapiro [5] defined commuting pairs of subalgebras purely in terms of (2) and (3).

Lemma 2.2.7. *If $(v_j)_{j \in J}$ is independent in a Boolean algebra B and $H_i \subset J$ for $i < n$, then $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(\langle\{v_h \mid h \in H_i\}\rangle)_{i<n}$.*

The above Lemma is much easier to prove given an ultrafilter characterization of commuting subalgebras, so we defer its proof until after Lemma 2.3.3.

Theorem 2.2.8. *Given $\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_{n-1}$ formulas of propositional logic such that $\bigwedge \vec{\varphi}$ is unsatisfiable, there exist tautological implications $\varphi_i \vdash \psi_i$ for $i < n$ such that $\bigwedge \vec{\psi}$ is unsatisfiable and, in each ψ_i, each variable occurs in φ_i and in at least one other φ_j.*

Proof. For each $i < n$, let H_i be the set of variables in φ_i. Let B be freely generated by $\bigcup \vec{H}$. Then each φ_i is in the subalgebra $A_i = \langle H_i \rangle$ and these subalgebras commute and, therefore, weakly commute. Hence, there exists $\vec{\psi} \in \prod_{i<n} \left\langle A_i \cap \bigcup_{j \neq i} A_j \right\rangle$ such that $\varphi_i \leq \psi_i$. Then $\vec{\psi}$ is as required because

$$\left\langle A_i \cap \bigcup_{j \neq i} A_j \right\rangle = \left\langle \bigcup_{j \neq i} (A_i \cap A_j) \right\rangle = \left\langle \bigcup_{j \neq i} (H_i \cap H_j) \right\rangle. \qquad \square$$

2.3. **n-Commutative n-cubes.** Heindorf and Shapiro obtained their concept of commuting pairs of subalgebras as a special case of the Stone dual of the much older concept of a bicommutative square, for which they cite Kuratowski's *Topology* [10]. In the category Set or Cpct_0 (and in many other concrete categories), a commutative square $f \circ g = h \circ k$ is *bicommutative* if, for all (x, y) satisfying $f(x) = h(y)$, there exists z such that $(g, k)(z) = (x, y)$. We immediately see that $f \circ g = h \circ k$ bicommutes iff the diagonal product $(g, k)(\bullet) = (g(\bullet), k(\bullet))$ maps $\mathrm{dom}(g)$ onto the canonical pullback (also called the fiber product) $\{(x, y) \mid f(x) = h(y)\}$.

In contrast to the binary case, our general concept of commuting n-tuples of subalgebras appears to be new. To take advantage of Stone duality, we introduce some category-theoretic concepts: n-(co)commutative n-(co)cubes.

Definition 2.3.1.

- A *commutative n-cube* (*commutative n-cocube*) is a functor from the poset category $(\mathcal{P}(n),\subset)$ ($(\mathcal{P}(n),\supset)$) to a category in which every finite diagram has a limit (colimit).
- A commutative n-cube $(f_t^s\colon X_s\to X_t \mid s\subset t\subset n)$ is *n-commutative* if $\boxtimes_{i<n} f^{\varnothing}_{\{i\}}\colon X_{\varnothing}\to \boxtimes_{s\neq\varnothing} X_s$ is an epimorphism.[13]
- A commutative n-cocube $(f_t^s\colon X_t\to X_s \mid s\subset t\subset n)$ is *n-cocommutative* if $\boxplus_{i<n} f^{\varnothing}_{\{i\}}\colon \boxplus_{s\neq\varnothing} X_s\to X_{\varnothing}$ is a monomorphism.[14]
- Given an arbitrary diagram in a category where every finite diagram a (co)limit, we say that the diagram is n-(co)commutative if every n-(co)cube subdiagram is n-(co)commutative.

Observation 2.3.2.

- *For the categories* Set *and* Cpct_0*, our canonical pullbacks yield the simple characterization that a commutative n-cube $(f_t^s\colon X_s\to X_t \mid s\subset t\subset n)$ is n-commutative iff, for each $\vec{p}\in\prod_{i<n} X_{\{i\}}$, if $f^{\{i\}}_{\{i,j\}}(p(i))=f^{\{j\}}_{\{i,j\}}(p(j))$ for all i,j, then there exists $q\in X_{\varnothing}$ such that $f^{\varnothing}_{\{i\}}(q)=p(i)$ for all i.*
- *By Lemma 2.1.15, a commutative n-cocube of inclusions*

$$\left(\mathrm{id}\colon \bigcap_{i\in t} A_i\to\bigcap_{i\in s} A_i \;\middle|\; s\subset t\subset n\right)$$

between subalgebras of a Boolean algebra B is n-cocommutative iff $\vec{A}$ n-commutes in B.[15]

The above observations allow us to prove the following ultrafilter characterization of commuting sequences of subalgebras.

Lemma 2.3.3. *Given $A_i\leq B$ for $i<n$, we have $\bigdownarrow\vec{A}$ iff, for all $\vec{U}\in\prod_{i<n}\mathrm{Ult}(A_i)$, if $U_i\cap A_j=U_j\cap A_i$ for all i,j, then $\bigcup\vec{U}$ extends to an ultrafilter of B.*

Proof. For each pair $s\subset t\subset n$, let $e_t^s=\mathrm{id}\colon\bigcap_{i\in t}A_i\to\bigcap_{i\in s}A_i$ and $f_t^s=\mathrm{Ult}(e_t^s)$. By Stone duality, we have $\bigdownarrow\vec{A}$ iff $(f_t^s)_{s\subset t}$ is n-commutative, which in turn is equivalent to the requirement that, for every $\vec{U}\in\prod\mathrm{Ult}(A_i)$, if $f^{\{i\}}_{\{i,j\}}(U_i)=f^{\{j\}}_{\{i,j\}}(U_j)$ for all i,j, then there exists $U\in\mathrm{Ult}(B)$ such that $f^{\varnothing}_{\{i\}}(U)=U_i$ for all i. But $f^{\{i\}}_{\{i,j\}}(U_i)=U_i\cap A_j$ and $f^{\varnothing}_{\{i\}}(U)=U\cap A_i$, so the lemma follows. □

Proof of Lemma 2.2.7. Let $A_i=\langle\{v_h \mid h\in H_i\}\rangle$. Assume $\vec{U}\in\prod_{i<n}\mathrm{Ult}(A_i)$ and $U_i\cap A_j=U_j\cap A_i$ for all i,j. Let $K=\bigcup\vec{H}$. Then, for each $k\in K$, there exists $e(k)<2$ such that $(-1)^{e(k)}v_k\in U_i$ for all $H_i\ni k$. Hence, $\bigcup\vec{U}$ extends to the filter of B generated by the finite meets of the form $\bigwedge_{k\in F}(-1)^{e(k)}v_k$. □

We also use Lemma 2.3.3 to deduce the useful lemmas Stepping Up, Grouping, and Continuity, and the independently interesting lemma Stepping Down.

Lemma 2.3.4 (Stepping Up)**.** *If $A_0,\dots,A_n\leq B$ are such that*

[13] In all the categories named in this paper, the epimorphisms are exactly the surjective morphisms.

[14] In all the categories named in this paper, the monomorphisms are exactly the injective morphisms.

[15] In this context, $\bigcap\varnothing=B$.

(1) $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(A_i)_{i<n}$,
(2) $A_n \cap \left\langle \bigcup_{i<n} A_i \right\rangle = \left\langle A_n \cap \bigcup_{i<n} A_i \right\rangle$, *and*
(3) $\left\langle \bigcup_{i<n} A_i \right\rangle \bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow A_n$,

then $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(A_i)_{i<n+1}$.

Proof. Suppose $\vec{U} \in \prod_{i<n+1} \mathrm{Ult}(A_i)$ and $U_i \cap A_j = U_j \cap A_i$. Extend $\bigcup_{j<n} U_j$ to $V \in \mathrm{Ult}(C)$ where $C = \left\langle \bigcup_{j<n} A_j \right\rangle$. Suppose $x \in U_n \cap C$. Then $x \in D$ where $D = A_n \cap C = \left\langle \bigcup_{j<n} (A_n \cap A_j) \right\rangle$. Let $x = \bigvee_{i<m} \bigwedge_{j<n} y_{i,j}$ for some m and $y_{i,j} \in A_n \cap A_j$. Since $U_n \cap C \in \mathrm{Ult}(D)$, we can choose $i < m$ such that $\bigwedge_{j<n} y_{i,j} \in U_n$. But then $y_{i,j} \in U_n \cap A_j \subset U_j \subset V$. Therefore, $x \in V$. Thus, $U_n \cap C \subset A_n \cap V$. Actually, $U_n \cap C = A_n \cap V$ since $A_n \cap V \in \mathrm{Ult}(D)$. Therefore, $U_n \cup V$ extends to $W \in \mathrm{Ult}(B)$. □

Examples 2.3.5, 2.3.6, and 2.4.2 show that no two of (1), (2), and (3) imply $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(A_i)_{i<n+1}$, even for $n = 2$. Moreover, $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(A_i)_{i<n+1}$ implies (3) by Grouping (2.3.11) and implies (2) by Weak Reflection (2.4.6). On the other hand, by Example 2.3.8, $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(A_i)_{i<n+1}$ does not imply (1).

Example 2.3.5. Let B be generated by g_i for $i < 3$ and the relation $\bigwedge \vec{g} = 0$. Letting $A_i = \langle \{g_i\} \rangle \leq B$, we have (A_i, A_j) independent for all pairs $i \neq j$ and

$$A_i \cap \langle A_j \cup A_k \rangle = \{0, 1\} = \langle A_i \cap (A_j \cup A_k) \rangle$$

for each permutation (i, j, k) of 3. Yet, letting $g_i \in U_i \in \mathrm{Ult}(A_i)$, we see that, by Lemma 2.3.3, $(A_i)_{i<3}$ does not commute.

Example 2.3.6. Let B be freely generated by $(g_i)_{i<2}$. Set $g_2 = (g_0 \wedge -g_1) \vee (-g_0 \wedge g_1)$. Letting $A_i = \langle \{g_i\} \rangle \leq B$, we have (A_i, A_j) independent for all pairs $i \neq j$ and $A_i \bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow \langle A_j \cup A_k \rangle$ for each permutation (i, j, k) of 3 simply because $\langle A_j \cup A_k \rangle = B$. Yet, letting $g_i \in U_i \in \mathrm{Ult}(A_i)$, we see that, by Lemma 2.3.3, $(A_i)_{i<3}$ does not commute.

Lemma 2.3.7 (Stepping Down)**.** *If* $A_0, \ldots, A_n \leq B$ *are such that*

(1) $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(A_i)_{i<n+1}$ *and*
(2) $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(A_i \cap A_n)_{i<n}$,

then $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(A_i)_{i<n}$.

Proof. Given $\vec{U} \in \prod_{i<n} \mathrm{Ult}(A_i)$ such that $U_i \cap A_j = U_j \cap A_i$, it suffices to find $V \in \mathrm{Ult}(B)$ such that $V \supset \bigcup_{i<n} U_i$. Let $W_i = U_i \cap A_n$. Since $W_i \cap A_j = W_j \cap A_i$, we may extend $\bigcup_{i<n} W_n$ to $U_n \in \mathrm{Ult}(A_n)$. But then $U_n \cap A_i = U_i \cap A_n$, so we may choose $V \in \mathrm{Ult}(B)$ such that $V \supset \bigcup_{i<n+1} U_i$. □

Examples 2.3.8 and 2.4.2 show that neither (1) alone nor (2) alone implies $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(A_i)_{i<n}$, even for $n = 2$.

Example 2.3.8. Let B be generated by g_i for $i < 3$ and the relation $g_0 \wedge g_1 = 0$. Let $A_i = \langle \{g_j \mid j \neq i\} \rangle$ for $i < 3$. Applying Interpolation (2.2.6), (A_0, A_1) does not commute because $g_1 \perp g_0$ yet g_1 and g_0 cannot be separated by any element of $A_0 \cap A_1$, which is $\langle \{g_2\} \rangle$. On the other hand, we claim that $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(A_i)_{i<3}$. Indeed, suppose $\vec{U} \in \prod_{i<3} \mathrm{Ult}(A_i)$ and $U_i \cap A_j = U_j \cap A_i$ for all i, j. For each $i < 3$, there exists $e(i) < 2$ such that $(-1)^{e(i)} g_i \in U_j$ for all $j \neq i$. Therefore, $\bigcup \vec{U}$ extends

to the ultrafilter of B iff $e(0)$ and $e(1)$ are not both 0, which is assured because $-g_0 \in U_2$ or $-g_1 \in U_2$.

The proof of Stepping Down generalizes to show that if a commutative $(n+1)$-cube $(f_t^s \colon X_s \to X_t)_{s \subset t \subset n+1}$ in the category Set or Cpct_0 is $(n+1)$-commutative and

$$\left(f_{t\cup\{n\}}^{s\cup\{n\}} \colon X_{s\cup\{n\}} \to X_{t\cup\{n\}} \;\middle|\; s \subset t \subset n\right)$$

is n-commutative, then $(f_t^s \colon X_s \to X_t)_{s \subset t \subset n}$ is n-commutative.

Definition 2.3.9. Given a Boolean algebra B:

- Given $S_i \subset B$ for $i < n$, let $\bigwedge \vec{S} = \left\{ \bigwedge \vec{a} \mid \vec{a} \in \prod \vec{S} \right\}$. Likewise define $\bigvee \vec{S}$.
- Given $S \subset B$, let $\langle S \rangle_\vee$ denote the set of all finite joins of elements S, including the empty join, which is 1_B. Likewise define $\langle S \rangle_\wedge$.

Observation 2.3.10.

- *If $F_i = \langle F_i \rangle_\wedge$ in a Boolean algebra B for $i < n$, then $B \vee \bigwedge F$ is the possibly improper filter of B generated by $\bigcup \vec{F}$.*
- *If $A_i \leq B$ for $i < n$, then $\left\langle \bigcup \vec{A} \right\rangle = \left\langle \bigwedge \vec{A} \right\rangle_\vee$.*

Lemma 2.3.11 (Grouping)**.** *If $\bigperp (A_k)_{k<n}$ in a Boolean algebra C and $\bigcup_{i<m} s(i) = n$, then also $\bigperp \vec{B}$ where $B_i = \left\langle \bigcup_{k \in s(i)} A_k \right\rangle$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\vec{U} \in \prod_{i<m} \mathrm{Ult}(B_i)$ and $U_i \cap B_j = U_j \cap B_i$ for $i, j < m$. Choose $r \colon n \to m$ such that $k \in s(r(k))$; let $V_k = U_{r(k)} \cap A_k$. We then have $V_k \cap A_l = V_l \cap A_k$ for $k, l < n$ and $U_i = B_i \vee \bigwedge_{k \in s(i)} V_k$ for $i < m$. Let F be the possibly improper filter of C generated by $\bigcup \vec{V}$, which is also the possibly improper filter generated by $\bigcup \vec{U}$. By hypothesis, $\bigcup \vec{V}$ and, hence, F extend to some $W \in \mathrm{Ult}(C)$. □

The proof of Grouping generalizes to show that, given $\bigcup_{i<m} r(i) = n$ and an n-commutative n-cube $(f_t^s \colon X_s \to X_t)_{s \subset t \subset n}$ in the category Set or Cpct_0, the commutative m-cube

$$\left(f_{\bigcup r[t]}^{\bigcup r[s]} \colon X_{\bigcup r[s]} \to X_{\bigcup r[t]} \;\middle|\; s \subset t \subset m\right)$$

is then m-commutative.

Lemma 2.3.12 (Continuity)**.** *Supppose that for each $i < n$ we have a set $\mathcal{A}_i$ of subalgebras of a fixed Boolean algebra C with union $B_i \leq C$, and that $\bigperp \vec{A}$ for each $\vec{A} \in \prod \vec{\mathcal{A}}$. We then have $\bigperp \vec{B}$.*

Proof. Given $\vec{U} \in \prod_{i<n} \mathrm{Ult}(B_i)$ whose union does not extend to any $V \in \mathrm{Ult}(C)$, it suffices to show that $U_i \cap B_j \neq U_j \cap B_i$ for some $i, j < n$. By hypothesis, there exists $\vec{x} \in \prod \vec{U}$ such that $\bigwedge \vec{x} = 0$. Choose $\vec{A} \in \prod \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\vec{x} \in \prod \vec{A}$. Then $\bigcup_{i<n} (U_i \cap A_i)$ does not extend to any $V \in \mathrm{Ult}(C)$. Hence, $U_i \cap A_i \cap A_j \neq U_j \cap A_j \cap A_i$ for some $i, j < n$. □

2.4. **Well-commuting sequences of subalgebras.** By Interpolation (2.2.6), if two Boolean algebras weakly commute, then they commute. However, as shown by Example 2.4.2 below, matters are not so simple for three algebras.

Lemma 2.4.1. *Suppose that $\langle S_i\rangle_\vee = A_i \leq B$ for $i < n$ and every $\vec{x} \in \prod \vec{S}$ has a weak incompatibility witness. We then have $\overset{\circ}{\downarrow}\vec{A}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\vec{z} \in \prod \vec{A}$ and $\bigwedge \vec{z} = 0$. Let $z_i = \bigvee_{m<N_i} w_i^m$ where $w_i^m \in S_i$. For each $f \in \prod \vec{N}$ and $i < n$, let $x_i^f = w_i^{f(i)}$. For each f, since $\bigwedge_{i<n} x_i^f = 0$, we may choose $\left(y_i^f\right)_{i<n} \in \prod_{i<n} \left\langle A_i \cap \bigcup_{j\neq i} A_j \right\rangle$ such that $x_i^f \leq y_i^f$ and $\bigwedge_{i<n} y_i^f = 0$. Then $z_i \leq u_i \in \left\langle A_i \cap \bigcup_{j\neq i} A_j \right\rangle$ where $u_i = \bigvee_{m<N_i} \bigwedge_{f(i)=m} y_i^f$. Finally,

$$\bigwedge \vec{u} = \bigwedge_{i<n} \bigvee_{m<N_i} \bigwedge_{f(i)=m} y_i^f = \bigvee_{g\in\prod \vec{N}} \bigwedge_{i<n} \bigwedge_{f(i)=g(i)} y_i^f \leq \bigvee_{g\in\prod \vec{N}} \bigwedge_{i<n} y_i^g = 0. \qquad \square$$

Example 2.4.2. Let B be generated by g_s for $s \in [3]^2$ and the relation $\bigwedge \vec{g} = 0$. Let $A_i = \langle \{g_s \mid i \in s\}\rangle \leq B$ for each $i < 3$. Observe that $A_i \cap A_j = \left\langle \{g_{\{i,j\}}\}\right\rangle$ for all $i < j < 3$. To see that $(A_i)_{i<3}$ does not commute, apply Lemma 2.3.3 to $\vec{U} \in \prod_{i<3} \mathrm{Ult}(A_i)$ where $\bigwedge_{s\ni i} g_s \in U_i$. On the other hand, we will prove that $\overset{\circ}{\downarrow}(A_i)_{i<3}$. By Lemma 2.4.1, given atoms x_i of A_i such that $\bigwedge \vec{x} = 0$, it suffices to find $\vec{y}$ as in Definition 2.2.1. Letting $x_i = \bigwedge_{j\neq i}(-1)^{\varepsilon(i,j)} g_{\{i,j\}}$ where $\varepsilon(i,j) < 2$, our assumption $\bigwedge \vec{x} = 0$ becomes the disjunction

(1) $\varepsilon(i,j) \neq \varepsilon(j,i)$ for some $i < j < 3$, or
(2) $\varepsilon(i,j) = 0$ for all distinct $i, j < 3$.

In Case (1), we let $y_i = (-1)^{\varepsilon(i,j)} g_{\{i,j\}}$, $y_j = (-1)^{\varepsilon(j,i)} g_{\{j,i\}}$, and $y_k = 1$ where $k \neq i, j$. In Case (2), we let $y_i = g_{i,i+_3 1}$. Thus, $\overset{\circ}{\downarrow}(A_i)_{i<3}$.

Since it is relevant to Stepping Up (2.3.4), we also note that, because $\langle A_0 \cup A_1\rangle = B$, we have $A_2 \downarrow \langle A_0 \cup A_1\rangle$. Moreover, $\langle A_2 \cap (A_0 \cup A_1)\rangle = A_2 = A_2 \cap \langle A_0 \cup A_1\rangle$. Relevant to Stepping Down (2.3.7), we note that $(A_0 \cap A_2, A_1 \cap A_2)$ commutes, but (A_0, A_1) does not, for $U_0 \cup U_1$ does not extend to an ultrafilter of B.

Our remaining goal for this subsection is to prove a condition sufficient for equivalence of weak commuting and commuting. We start by proving a partial converse (Weak Reflection (2.4.6)) to Stepping Up (2.3.4).

Definition 2.4.3. Given $A, B, C \leq D$, we say that A and B *commute over* C and write $A \underset{C}{\downarrow} B$ if, for all pairs $A \ni x \perp y \in B$, there exists $z \in C$ such that $x \leq z \perp y$.

By Interpolation (2.2.6), if $A \underset{C}{\downarrow} B$ and $C \subset A \cap B$, then $A \downarrow B$. Actually, $C = A \cap B$ because of the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4.4. *If $A \underset{C}{\downarrow} B$, then $A \cap B \subset C$.*

Proof. Given $x \in A \cap B$, we have $A \ni x \perp -x \in B$. Hence, $x \leq y \perp -x$ for some $y \in C$. But then $x = y \in C$. $\square$

Lemma 2.4.5. *Given $A, B, C \leq D$, $\langle S\rangle_\vee = A$, and $\langle T\rangle_\vee = B$, if for all pairs $S \ni x \perp y \in T$ there exists $z \in C$ such that $x \leq z \perp y$, then $A \underset{C}{\downarrow} B$.*

Proof. Given $A \ni x \perp y \in B$, let $x = \bigvee_{i<m} s_i$ and $y = \bigvee_{j<n} t_j$ where $s_i \in S$ and $t_j \in T$. Let $s_i \leq u_{i,j} \perp t_j$ for all i, j. Then $x \leq \bigvee_{i<m} \bigwedge_{j<n} u_{i,j} \perp y$. $\square$

Lemma 2.4.6 (Weak Reflection)**.** *Suppose that* $\overset{\circ}{\downarrow}(A_i)_{i<n+1}$*. Then* $\langle \bigcup_{i<n} A_i \rangle \downarrow A_n$ *and*

$$A_n \cap \left\langle \bigcup_{i<n} A_i \right\rangle = \left\langle A_n \cap \bigcup_{i<n} A_i \right\rangle.$$

Proof. We will prove $A_n \underset{C}{\downarrow} B$ where $B = \langle \bigcup_{i<n} A_i \rangle$ and $C = \langle A_n \cap \bigcup_{i<n} A_i \rangle$. Suppose that $A_n \ni x \perp y \in B$. Without loss of generality, $y = \bigwedge_{i<n} y_i$ where $y_i \in A_i$. Let $z_i = y_i$ and $z_n = x$. Then there exists $\vec{w} \in \prod_{i<n+1} \left\langle A_i \cap \bigcup_{j\neq i} A_j \right\rangle$ such that $z_i \leq w_i$ and $\bigwedge \vec{w} = 0$. Therefore, $w_n \in C$ and $x \leq w_n \perp y$. □

Definition 2.4.7. Given $A_i \leq B$ for $i < n$, we say that $\vec{A}$ *(weakly) commutes well* if $(A_i)_{i<m}$ (weakly) commutes for each $m \leq n$.

Theorem 2.4.8. *If* $(A_i)_{i<n}$ *weakly commutes well, then it commutes well.*

Proof. Suppose $m < n$. By Weak Reflection (2.3.11), we have $\langle \bigcup_{i<m} A_i \rangle \downarrow A_m$ and

$$A_m \cap \left\langle \bigcup_{i<m} A_i \right\rangle = \left\langle A_m \cap \bigcup_{i<m} A_i \right\rangle.$$

If we assume inductively that $\bigdownarrow(A_i)_{i<m}$, then $\bigdownarrow(A_i)_{i<m+1}$ by Stepping Up (2.3.4). □

Example 2.4.9. There is a weakly commuting triple of Boolean algebras (A_0, A_1, A_2) such that (A_0, A_1) does not weakly commute.

Proof. Consider $(A_i)_{i<3}$ from Example 2.4.2, which is weakly commuting but not commuting. If $(A_i)_{i<2}$ were weakly commuting, then Theorem 2.4.8 would imply that $(A_i)_{i<3}$ commuted. □

2.5. **Amalgamation of reflecting sequences.**

Definition 2.5.1. Given overlapping Boolean algebras $A_0, \ldots, A_{n-1}$:

- A set M *commutatively reflects* $(A_i)_{i<n}$ if
  (1) $A_i \cap M \leq A_i$,
  (2) $\bigdownarrow(\boxplus_i [A_i \cap M])_{i<n}$ in $\boxplus \vec{A}$, and
  (3) $\boxplus_i [A_i] \cap \left\langle \bigcup_{j<n} \boxplus_j [A_j \cap M] \right\rangle = \boxplus_i [A_i \cap M]$ in $\boxplus \vec{A}$.
- We say that $\vec{A}$ is *commutatively reflecting* if A_m commutatively reflects $(A_i)_{i<m}$ for each $m < n$.

Theorem 2.5.2. *Suppose that* $A_0, \ldots, A_{n-1}$ *is commutatively reflecting and* $\bigdownarrow(A_i \cap A_m)_{i<m}$ *in* A_m *for all* $m < n$*. Then there are pushouts* $B_m = \boxplus_{i<m} A_i$ *for* $m \leq n$ *such that* $A_i, B_i \leq B_j$ *for all* $i < j \leq n$*.*

Proof. Though our proof does not depend on it, it may be instructive to refer to the diagram below when reading the proof.



Given $m < n$ and a pushout $B = \boxplus_{i<m} A_i$ with coprojections $\boxplus^B_i \colon A_i \to B$ that are injective for all $i < m$, it suffices to find a pushout $C = \boxplus_{i<m+1} A_i$ with coprojections $\boxplus^C_i \colon A_i \to C$ that are injective for all $i < m+1$, and a Boolean embedding $e \colon B \to C$ such that $\boxplus^C_i = e \circ \boxplus^B_i$ for all $i < m$. Since $\bigdownarrow(A_i \cap A_m)_{i<m}$, we may choose $D = \boxplus_{i<m}(A_i \cap A_m)$ such that $A_i \cap A_m \leq D \leq A_m$ for all $i < m$. For each $i < m$, let $h_i = \mathrm{id} \colon A_i \cap A_m \to A_i$ and $\boxplus^D_i = \mathrm{id} \colon A_i \cap A_m \to D$. Let $f = \mathrm{id} \colon D \to A_m$ and let $g \colon D \to B$ be the mediating morphism satisfying $\boxplus^B_i \circ h_i = g \circ \boxplus^D_i$ for all $i < m$. By (2) of Definition 2.5.1, g is injective.

Let C and coprojections $\alpha \colon A_m \to C$, $\beta \colon B \to C$, and $\gamma \colon D \to C$ be a pushout of $A_m \xleftarrow{f} D \xrightarrow{g} B$. By definition of colimit, $\alpha \circ f = \gamma = \beta \circ g$. By Lemma 2.1.19, each of α, β, and γ is a Boolean embedding. For each pair $\varnothing \neq s \subset t \subset m+1$, let $\zeta^s_t = \mathrm{id} \colon E_t \to E_s$ where $E_s = \bigcap_{i \in s} A_i$, thus defining an $(m+1)$-ary span. Let $E_\varnothing = C$, and for each $s \in \mathcal{P}_+(m+1)$, let $\zeta^{\varnothing}_s \colon E_s \to E_\varnothing$ be $\alpha \circ \zeta^{\{m\}}_s$ if $m \in s$ else $\beta \circ \boxplus^B_{\max(s)} \circ \zeta^{\{\max(s)\}}_s$.

Claim. Given $\varnothing \neq s \subset t \subset m+1$, we have $\zeta^{\varnothing}_t = \zeta^{\varnothing}_s \circ \zeta^s_t$.

Proof. If $m \in s$, then

$$\zeta^{\varnothing}_t = \alpha \circ \zeta^{\{m\}}_t = \alpha \circ \zeta^{\{m\}}_s \circ \zeta^s_t = \zeta^{\varnothing}_s \circ \zeta^s_t.$$

If $m \notin t$, then, letting $i = \max(s)$ and $j = \max(t)$,

$$\zeta^{\varnothing}_t = \beta \circ \boxplus^B_j \circ \zeta^{\{j\}}_t = \beta \circ \boxplus^B_i \circ \zeta^{\{i\}}_t = \beta \circ \boxplus^B_i \circ \zeta^{\{i\}}_s \circ \zeta^s_t = \zeta^{\varnothing}_s \circ \zeta^s_t.$$

If $m \in t \setminus s$, then, letting $i = \max(s)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta^{\varnothing}_t = \alpha \circ \zeta^{\{m\}}_t = \alpha \circ f \circ \boxplus^D_i \circ \zeta^{\{i,m\}}_t = \beta \circ g \circ \boxplus^D_i \circ \zeta^{\{i,m\}}_t = \beta \circ \boxplus^B_i \circ h_i \circ \zeta^{\{i,m\}}_t \\ = \beta \circ \boxplus^B_i \circ \zeta^{\{i\}}_t = \beta \circ \boxplus^B_i \circ \zeta^{\{i\}}_s \circ \zeta^s_t = \zeta^{\varnothing}_s \circ \zeta^s_t. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the morphisms $\vec{\zeta}$ form a commutative $(m+1)$-cocube. Moreover, letting $e = \beta$ and $\boxplus^C_i = \zeta^{\varnothing}_{\{i\}}$ for each $i < m+1$, we have $\boxplus^C_i$ injective for each $i < m+1$, $e \circ \boxplus^B_i = \boxplus^C_i$ for each $i < m$, and $C = \langle \bigcup_{i<m+1} \boxplus^C_i[A_i] \rangle$. Therefore, it suffices to show that $\bigdownarrow(\boxplus^C_i[A_i])_{i<m+1}$.

Letting $A'_m = \alpha[A_m]$, $B' = \beta[B]$, and $D' = \gamma[D]$, we have $D' \subset A'_m \cap B'$ and $A'_m \underset{D'}{\downarrow} B'$. Hence,

$$B' \downarrow A'_m. \tag{2.1}$$

Also, $D' = A'_m \cap B'$ by Lemma 2.4.4. Letting $A'_i = (\beta \circ \boxplus_i^B)[A_i]$ for $i < m$, we have $B' = \langle \bigcup_{i<m} A'_i \rangle$ and

$$\bigdownarrow (A'_i)_{i<m} \tag{2.2}$$

because β is a Boolean embedding. Letting $A'_{i,m} = \gamma[A_i \cap A_m]$ for $i < m$, we have $A'_m \cap B' = D' = \langle \bigcup_{i<m} A'_{i,m} \rangle$. Therefore, the claim below implies that

$$A'_m \cap \left\langle \bigcup_{i<m} A'_i \right\rangle = \left\langle \bigcup_{i<m} (A'_i \cap A'_m) \right\rangle. \tag{2.3}$$

Claim. Given $i < m$, $A'_i \cap A'_m = A'_{i,m}$.

Proof. First, $A'_i \cap A'_m = A_i \cap D'$ and $D' = (\beta \circ g)[D]$. Therefore, $A'_i \cap A'_m = \beta\left[\boxplus_i^B[A_i] \cap g[D]\right]$. By (3) of Definition 2.5.1, we have $\boxplus_i^B[A_i] \cap g[D] = g[A_i \cap A_m]$. Hence, $A'_i \cap A'_m = (\beta \circ g)[A_i \cap A_m] = A'_{i,m}$. □

Applying Stepping Up to (2.1)–(2.3), we obtain $\bigdownarrow (A'_i)_{i<m+1}$. From our definitions, $A'_i = \boxplus_i^C[A_i]$. So, $\bigdownarrow (\boxplus_i^C[A_i])_{i<m+1}$ as desired. □

Examples 2.1.20 and 2.3.8 each show that the conjunction of the hypotheses of Theorem 2.5.2 is strictly stronger than necessary for the mere amalgamation of n overlapping Boolean aglebras. However, since Theorem 2.5.2 is strong enough for this paper's direct limit constructions, we leave open the search for sharper amalgamation theorems.

Problem 2.5.3. Find an interesting, necessary, and sufficient condition for n overlapping Boolean algebras $A_0, \ldots, A_{n-1}$ to have a common extension, or, equivalently, for all the coprojections $\boxplus_i \colon A_i \to \coprod \vec{A}$ to be injective.

Question 2.5.4. Suppose that we encode a finite sequence of overlapping finite Boolean algebras $A_0, \ldots, A_{n-1}$ by the induced poset of the atoms of the intersections $\bigcap_{i \in s} A_i$ for $s \in \mathcal{P}_+(n)$ with each atom x labeled by $\{i < n \mid x \in A_i\}$. Is there a polynomial-time procedure for deciding whether an arbitrary such $\vec{A}$ has a common extension?

By the Stone dual of Corollary 2.1.16, $\vec{A}$ as in Question 2.5.4 has a common extension iff, for each $k < n$ and $x \in \mathrm{Ult}(A_k)$, there exists $\vec{y} \in \boxtimes(\mathrm{Ult}(A_i))_{i<n}$ such that $y_k = x$. The corresponding brute-force search algorithm is in $\Pi_2\mathrm{P}$ in the polynomial hierarchy and has $O(\log^2(N))$ space complexity (which implies quasipolynomial time complexity).

3. Direct limits indexed by structures

3.1. **Elementary substructures.**

Definition 3.1.1. Given θ a regular uncountable cardinal, let $\mathfrak{H}$ denote the first-order structure $(H(\theta), \in, \sqsubset_\theta)$ where $H(\theta)$ is the set of all sets with transitive closure smaller than θ and $\sqsubset_\theta$ is a well-ordering of $H(\theta)$. Given a set M, by $M \prec \mathfrak{H}$ we mean that M is the universe of an elementary substructure of $\mathfrak{H}$.[16]

[16] That is, for each first-order sentence φ using non-logical symbols $\in$, $\sqsubset_\theta$, and parameters from M, the sentence φ is true in $(M, \in, \sqsubset_\theta)$ iff it is true in $\mathfrak{H}$.

In place of elements E of some club $\mathcal{E} \subset [A]^{<\kappa}$ where $\mathcal{E}$ is tailored for the argument at hand, we often find it more convenient to use sets of the form $M \cap A$ for $(<\kappa)$-sized $M \prec \mathfrak{H}$. For our purposes, nothing is lost, for if $[A]^{<\kappa} \in H(\theta)$ and $\mathcal{C} \subset [A]^{<\kappa}$ is a club, then

$$\{A \cap M \mid \mathcal{C} \in M \prec \mathfrak{H} \text{ and } |A \cap M| < \kappa \text{ and } [H(\theta)]^{<\kappa} \cap M \subset [M]^{<\kappa}\} \tag{3.1}$$

is a club[17] and a subset of $\mathcal{C}$. This follows from a special case of the Downward Lowenheim-Skolem Theorem: if $\omega \leq \kappa < \theta$ and $B \in [H(\theta)]^{<\kappa}$, then some $M \in [H(\theta)]^{<\kappa}$ satisfies $B \subset M \prec \mathfrak{H}$. Most importantly, if $M \prec \mathfrak{H}$, then $(M, \in)$, like $(H(\theta), \in)$, satisfies every ZFC axiom except possibly Power Set. As such, M has almost all the closure properties we need for any particular argument in this paper, provided M contains some finite set consisting of some explicitly given objects and possibly some of their iterated power sets. The only additional closure property we sometimes need is $[H(\theta)]^{<\kappa} \cap M \subset [M]^{<\kappa}$. When $\kappa = \aleph_1$, this last property is automatic: if $B \in M$ and B is countable, then $B \subset M$ because $\omega \subset M$ and M agrees with $\mathfrak{H}$ that there is a surjection from ω to B. We refer the reader to [9] for additional background information about $H(\theta)$ and elementary substructures.

Convention 3.1.2.

- If $M \prec \mathfrak{H}$ and X is a topological space, then by $X \in M$ we mean that the topology of X is an element of M.
- If $M \prec \mathfrak{H}$ and A is a Boolean algebra, then by $A \in M$ we mean that $\leq_A$ is an element of M.
- We implicitly assume θ is large enough that every set needed for the argument at hand is in $H(\theta)$.

The well-ordering $\sqsubset_\theta$ is not essential for any of the above benefits.[18] However, it will significantly simplify some parts of this paper to have $M, N \prec \mathfrak{H}$ imply $M \cap N \prec \mathfrak{H}$.[19] Without $\sqsubset_\theta$, we cannot guarantee $M \cap N \prec \mathfrak{H}$ without making an additional assumption such as $M \in N$.

Our first application of elementary substructures is to prove that products and retracts preserve d-open generation.

Lemma 3.1.3. *Given $d \leq \omega$ and a Tychonoff space X, the following are equivalent.*

1. *X is d-openly generated.*
2. *If $n < d$ and $X \in M_i \prec \mathfrak{H}$ and $|M_i| = \aleph_0$ for $i < n$, then $q^X_{\bigcup \vec{M}}$ is open.*

Proof. (1)⇒(2): Let X be d-openly generated and let $n < d$ and $X \in M_i \prec \mathfrak{H}$ and $|M_i| = \aleph_0$ for $i < n$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the $\sqsubset_\theta$-least club witnessing that X is d-openly generated. Then $C(X) \cap M_i \in \mathcal{C}$ for $i < n$; hence, $q^X_{\bigcup \vec{M}}$ is open.

(2)⇒(1): Given X satisfying (2), let

$$\mathcal{C} = \{C(X) \cap M \mid X \in M \prec \mathfrak{H} \text{ and } |M| = \aleph_0\},$$

which is a club witnessing (1). □

[17] To see why this set is cofinal in $[A]^{<\kappa}$, see the proof of Lemma 3.2.4.

[18] Without $\sqsubset_\theta$, the set in (3.1) might not be a club, but it would still contain a club and still be a subset of $\mathcal{C}$.

[19] If $\mathfrak{H} \models \exists x.\varphi(\vec{a}, x)$ and $\vec{a} \in M \cap N$, then, by elementarity, the $\sqsubset_\theta$-least b where $\mathfrak{H} \models \varphi(\vec{a}, b)$ is in both M and N.

Theorem 3.1.4. *Given $d \leq \omega$, products preserve d-open generation of Tychonoff spaces.*

Proof. Suppose that S is a set and X_s is d-openly generated for $s \in S$. Suppose also $m < d$, $X = \prod \vec{X}$, and $X \in M_i \prec \mathfrak{H}$ and $|M_i| = \aleph_0$ for $i < m$. We will show that q^X_K is open where $K = \bigcup \vec{M}$. Suppose we have a finite $F \subset S$, an open $U_s \subset X_s$ for each $s \in F$, and $x \in U = \bigcap_{s \in F} \pi_s^{-1}[U_s]$. It suffices to find $\psi_0, \ldots, \psi_{n-1} \in C(X) \cap K$ and $\delta > 0$ such that, for all $y \in X$, if $\psi_k(y) \underset{\delta}{\approx} \psi_k(x)$ for all $k < n$, then there exists $z \in U$ such that $q^X_K(z) = q^X_K(y)$. Let $T = F \cap K$. For each $t \in T$, let $L(t) = \bigcup_{M_i \ni t} M_i$. By hypothesis, for each $t \in T$, there exist $\varepsilon(t) > 0$, $l(t) < \omega$, and $\varphi_{t,j} \in C(X_i) \cap L(t)$ for $j < l(t)$ such that, for all $y \in X_t$, if $\varphi_{t,j}(y) \underset{\varepsilon(t)}{\approx} \varphi_{t,j}(x(t))$ for all $j < l(t)$, then there exists $z \in U_t$ such that $q^{X_t}_{L(t)}(z) = q^{X_t}_{L(t)}(y)$. Therefore, we obtain our required δ and $\vec{\psi}$ by letting $\delta = \min_{t \in T} \varepsilon(t)$ and

$$\{\psi_k \mid k < n\} = \bigcup_{t \in T} \{\varphi_{t,j} \circ \pi_t \mid j < l(t)\}. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 3.1.5. *Given*

- *X, Y Tychonoff spaces and $f \colon X \to Y$ continuous,*
- *a set S and $X, Y, f \in M_s \prec \mathfrak{H}$ for $s \in S$,*
- *and $K = \bigcup \vec{M}$,*

there is a unique continuous map $f/K \colon X/K \to Y/K$ such that $f/K \circ q^X_K = q^Y_K \circ f$.

Proof. Uniqueness: Suppose that $x_i \in X$, $g_i \colon X/K \to Y$, and $g_i \circ q^X_K = q^Y_K \circ f$ for $i < 2$, and that $g_0(q^X_K(x_0)) \neq g_1(q^X_K(x_1))$. It suffices to show that $q^X_K(x_0) \neq q^X_K(x_1)$. By hypothesis, $q^Y_K(f(x_0)) \neq q^Y_K(f(x_1))$. Hence, there exists $s \in S$ and $\varphi \in C(Y) \cap M_s$ such that $\varphi(f(x_0)) \neq \varphi(f(x_1))$. But $\varphi \circ f \in C(X) \cap M_s$; hence, $q^X_K(x_0) \neq q^X_K(x_1)$.

Existence: For each $p \in X/K$, choose $c(p) \in X$ such that $q^X_K(c(p)) = p$ and declare $(f/K)(p) = q^Y_K(f(c(p)))$. Suppose that $(p_i)_{i \in I}$ is a net converging to some p_∞ in X/K. Given $s \in S$ and $\varphi \in C(Y) \cap M_s$, we have $\varphi \circ f \in M_s$. Hence, given also $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $i_0 \in I$ such that $\varphi(f(c(p_i))) \underset{\varepsilon}{\approx} \varphi(f(c(p_\infty)))$ for $i \geq i_0$. Therefore, $(q^Y_K(f(c(p_i))))_{i \in I}$ converges to $q^Y_K(f(c(p_\infty)))$. Thus, f/K is continuous. $\square$

Observation 3.1.6. *If $f \circ g$ is open and g is continuous, then f is open.*

Theorem 3.1.7. *Given $d \leq \omega$, retracts preserve d-open generation of Tychonoff spaces.*

Proof. Suppose that Y is a Tychonoff space and that there exist d-openly generated X and continuous maps $Y \xleftarrow{r} X \xleftarrow{e} Y$ such that $r \circ e = \mathrm{id} \colon Y \to Y$. Keeping Y fixed, choose (X, r, e) to be $\sqsubset_\theta$-least possible. Suppose also $m < d$ and $K = \bigcup \vec{M}$ where $Y \in M_i \prec \mathfrak{H}$ and $|M_i| = \aleph_0$ for $i < m$. By Lemma 3.1.5, $(r/K) \circ (e/K) = \mathrm{id} \colon Y/K \to Y/K$; hence, $(r/K) \circ (e/K)$ is open; hence, r/K is open. By hypothesis, q^X_K is open; hence, $(r/K) \circ q^X_K$ is open. Since $(r/K) \circ q^X_K = q^Y_K \circ r$, the map $q^Y_K \circ r$ is also open; hence, q^Y_K is open. $\square$

Our second application of elementary substructures is to justify our remark in Subsection 1.1 that one cannot construct a Boolean algebra of size $\geq \aleph_3$ as a direct

limit of countable Boolean algebras without amalgamating non-Δ-system tuples of overlapping Boolean algebras.

Theorem 3.1.8. *Given $1 \leq n < \omega$ and a cardinal κ, the following are equivalent.*

1. $\kappa \geq \omega_n$.
2. *For each club $\mathcal{E} \subset [\kappa]^{<\aleph_1}$, there exist $M_0, \dots, M_{n-1} \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\kappa \cap \bigcap_{j\neq i} M_j \not\subset M_i$ for all $i < n$.*
3. *For each $x \in H(\theta)$, there exist countable $M_0, \dots, M_{n-1} \prec \mathfrak{H}$ such that $x \in M_i$ and $\kappa \cap \bigcap_{j\neq i} M_j \not\subset M_i$ for all $i < n$.*
4. *For each $x \in H(\theta)$, there exist $M_0, \dots, M_{n-1} \prec \mathfrak{H}$ such that $x \in M_i$ and $\kappa \cap \bigcap_{j\neq i} M_j \not\subset M_i$ for all $i < n$.*

Lemma 3.1.9. *If κ is a cardinal, $M, N \prec \mathfrak{H}$, and $\kappa \cap M \subset N$, then $\kappa^+ \cap M \cap N$ is downward closed in $\kappa^+ \cap M$.*

Proof. Given $\alpha \in \kappa^+ \cap M \cap N$, let f be the $\sqsubset_\theta$-least surjection from $|\alpha|$ to α. Given $\beta \in \alpha \cap M$, we have $\beta = f(\gamma)$ for some $\gamma \in \kappa \cap M$. But then $\gamma \in N$, and, therefore, $\beta \in N$. □

Definition 3.1.10. S_n is the group of permutations of n.

Proof of Theorem 3.1.8. (1)⇒(4): Given $0 < i \leq n$ and $M_{n-1}, \dots, M_i \in H(\theta)$, choose $M_{i-1} \prec \mathfrak{H}$ of size $\aleph_{i-1}$ such that $x, M_{n-1}, \dots, M_i \in M_{i-1}$ and $\omega_{i-1} \subset M_{i-1}$. Next, given $M_{n-1}, \dots, M_0$ so constructed, suppose $s \subset n$. We will prove that $|D_m| \geq \aleph_m$ for all $m \leq n$ where

$$D_m = \omega_n \cap \bigcap_{m\leq i\notin s} M_i \setminus \bigcup_{m\leq i\in s} M_i.$$

If $m = n$, then $D_m = \omega_m$. So, suppose $m < n$ and $|D_{m+1}| \geq \aleph_{m+1}$. If $m \in s$, then $D_m = D_{m+1} \setminus M_m$, which has size $|D_{m+1}|$ because $|M_m| < |D_{m+1}|$. If $m \notin s$, then $D_m = D_{m+1} \cap M_m$, which has size $\aleph_m$ because $\omega_m \subset M_m$ and M_m knows that $|D_{m+1}| \geq \omega_m$. By (backwards) induction, D_0 is infinite. Hence, for each $i < n$, letting $s = \{i\}$, we obtain $\kappa \cap \bigcup_{j\neq i} M_j \not\subset M_i$.

(4)⇒(1): Given $M_0, \dots, M_{n-1} \prec \mathfrak{H}$, we will inductively construct $\tau \in S_n$ such that $\omega_{n-1} \cap \bigcap_{i<n-1} M_{\tau(i)} \subset M_{\tau(n-1)}$. First, observe that $\{\omega_1 \cap M_i \mid i < n\}$ is a chain. Given $k < n$, inductively assume that we have $\sigma_k \colon k \to n$ injective and

$$\left\{ \omega_{k+1} \cap M_i \cap \bigcap_{j<k} M_{\sigma_k(j)} \;\middle|\; i \in n \setminus \operatorname{ran}(\sigma_k) \right\}$$

a chain. Choose $i \in n \setminus \operatorname{ran}(\sigma_k)$ so as to obtain the minimum of the above chain; extend σ_k to σ_{k+1} by declaring $\sigma_{k+1}(k) = i$. By Lemma 3.1.9,

$$\left\{ \omega_{k+2} \cap M_i \cap M_h \cap \bigcap_{j<k} M_{\sigma_k(j)} \;\middle|\; h \in n \setminus \operatorname{ran}(\sigma_{k+1}) \right\}$$

consists of downward closed subsets of $\omega_{k+2} \cap M_i \cap \bigcap_{j<k} M_{\sigma_k(j)}$, and so is a chain. Having thus preserved our inductive hypothesis, we now declare $\tau = \sigma_n$. By construction,

$$\omega_{n-1} \cap M_{\tau(n-2)} \cap \bigcap_{j<n-2} M_{\tau(j)} \subset \omega_{n-1} \cap M_{\tau(n-1)} \cap \bigcap_{j<n-2} M_{\tau(j)}.$$

(4)⇒(3): Given $\vec{M}$ as in (2), choose $N \prec \mathfrak{H}$ such that $x, \vec{M} \in N$ and N is countable. Let $P_i = M_i \cap N$. Since N knows that $E_i = \kappa \cap \bigcap_{j\neq i} M_j \setminus M_i$ is nonempty, E_i intersects N. Thus, $\kappa \cap \bigcap_{j\neq i} P_j \not\subset P_i$.

(3)⇒(4): Trivial.

(3)⇒(2): Given a club $\mathcal{E} \subset [\kappa]^{<\aleph_1}$, if $\mathcal{E} \in M \prec \mathfrak{H}$ and $|M| = \aleph_0$, then $\kappa \cap M \in \mathcal{E}$.

(2)⇒(3): The following set is a club.

$$\{\kappa \cap M \mid x \in M \prec \mathfrak{H} \text{ and } |M| = \aleph_0\} \qquad \square$$

3.2. **Long λ-approximation sequences.**

Convention 3.2.1. For the remainder of this paper, λ is assumed to be a regular uncountable cardinal.

Definition 3.2.2. Given an ordinal η, a transfinite sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$ is called a *long λ-approximation sequence* if, for each $\alpha < \eta$,

(1) $|M_\alpha| < \lambda$,
(2) $[H(\theta)]^{<\lambda} \cap M_\alpha \subset [M_\alpha]^{<\lambda}$,
(3) $M_\alpha \prec \mathfrak{H}$, and
(4) the sequence $(M_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$ is an element of M_α.

Observation 3.2.3.

- *For the most important case, $\lambda = \omega_1$, the requirement* (2) *is redundant.*
- *Requirements* (3) *and* (4) *entail $\eta \leq \theta$.*

First, we show that long λ-approximation sequences exist.

Lemma 3.2.4. *Given $S \in [H(\theta)]^{<\lambda}$ and a long λ-approximation sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$, there exists M_η such that $S \subseteq M_\eta$ and $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta+1}$ is a long λ-approximation sequence.*

Proof. Let N_0 be the union of S and the singleton $\{(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}\}$. Given $i < \omega$ and $N_i \in [H(\theta)]^{<\lambda}$, let $P = N_i \cup \bigcup (N_i \cap [H(\theta)]^{<\lambda})$ and let N_{i+1} be the set of all $b \in H(\theta)$ for which there exist parameters $\vec{a} \in P^{<\omega}$ and a first-order formula φ such that b is the $\sqsubset_\theta$-least x for which $\mathfrak{H} \models \varphi(\vec{a}, b)$. Let $M_\eta = \bigcup \vec{N}$. $\square$

We caution that $\{M_\beta \mid \beta < \alpha\}$ and $\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} M_\alpha$ are not subsets of M_α if $\alpha \geq \lambda$. In fact, we have the following characterization of $M_\beta \subset M_\alpha$.

Lemma 3.2.5 (Ordering [12, Lem. 2.2])**.** *Given a long λ-approximation sequence $\vec{M}$, the following are equivalent.*

- $M_\beta \subset M_\alpha$
- $M_\beta \in M_\alpha \cup \{M_\alpha\}$
- $\beta \in (\alpha + 1) \cap M_\alpha$

Corollary 3.2.6. *If $\vec{M}$ is a long λ-approximation sequence, then $M_0 \subset M_\alpha$ for all α.*

Definition 3.2.2 is a special case of the author's Definition 3.16 in [13], which in turn is a more flexible version of the tree of substructures which Davies [1] introduced to prove the plane a union of countably many rotated graphs of functions, and which, much later, Jackson and Mauldin [6] used to prove the existence of a Steinhaus set.[20] The author's original motivation for introducing long λ-approximation

[20] A subset of the plane is Steinhaus if it intersects every isometric copy of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ at exactly one point.

sequences was to prove a base property[21] for compact groups. [13, Cor. 3.22] The author later applied long λ-approximation sequences to Boolean algebras in [11] and [12]. More recently, Daniel Soukup [19] gave some additional applications of long ω_1-approximation sequences to infinite combinatorics and introduced the shorter name *Davies sequence* for a long ω_1-approximation sequence.

From [12] we will cite several useful lemmas. In that work, our requirement $M_i \prec \mathfrak{H}$ only appeared in the weaker form $M_i \prec (H(\theta), \in)$, so all the results there apply here.

Definition 3.2.7.

- Given an ordinal $\alpha \geq \lambda$, let $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor$ denote the maximum of the set of all ordinal products $|\alpha| \cdot \beta$ that are $\leq \alpha$. Given an ordinal $\alpha < \lambda$, let $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor = \alpha$. In both cases, let $\partial\alpha$ denote the unique γ satisfying $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor + \gamma = \alpha$.
- Let $\partial^0\alpha = \alpha$ and $\partial^{i+1}\alpha = \partial\partial^i\alpha$ for all $i < \omega$.
- Since $\partial^{i+1}\alpha < |\partial^i\alpha|$ if $\partial^i\alpha > 0$, there is a least $i < \omega$ for which $\partial^i\alpha = 0$. We denote this i by $\urcorner_\lambda(\alpha)$, or just $\urcorner(\alpha)$ when there is no ambiguity.
- Let $\partial_i\alpha = \left\lfloor \partial^i\alpha \right\rfloor$ for all $i < \urcorner(\alpha)$.
- The *λ-truncated cardinal normal form* of α is the sequence $(\partial_i\alpha)_{i<\urcorner(\alpha)}$. For easier reading, we may omit "λ-truncated"; for better intuition, we interpret the sequence as a formal sum, *i.e.*, "$\sum_{i<\urcorner(\alpha)} \partial_i\alpha$ is the cardinal normal form of α."

Observation 3.2.8.

- *As an ordinal sum, $\sum_{i<\urcorner(\alpha)} \partial_i\alpha$ indeed equals α.*
- *$\urcorner(\alpha) = 0$ iff $\alpha = 0$.*
- *$\urcorner(\alpha) = 1$ if α is a nonzero cardinal.*
- *If $n < \omega$ and $\alpha \leq \lambda^{+n}$, then $\urcorner(\alpha) \leq n + 1$.*

Cardinal normal form is implicit in the proof of Lemma 3.17 of [13] and explicit in Definition 2.2 of [12]. The motivation for cardinal normal form is the following fundamental lemma.

Definition 3.2.9. Given a long λ-approximation sequence $(M_\beta)_{\beta<\eta}$, $\alpha \leq \eta$, and $i < \urcorner(\alpha)$:

- $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor_i = \sum_{j<i} \partial_j\alpha$
- $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor_{\urcorner(\alpha)} = \alpha$
- $I_i(\alpha) = \left[\lfloor \alpha \rfloor_i , \lfloor \alpha \rfloor_{i+1} \right)$
- $\mathcal{I}_i(\alpha) = \{ M_\beta \mid \beta \in I_i(\alpha) \}$
- $M_{\alpha,i} = \bigcup \mathcal{I}_i(\alpha)$

Lemma 3.2.10 (Fundamental Lemma [12, Lem. 2.2])**.** *Every $\mathcal{I}_i(\alpha)$ is directed with respect to inclusion. Hence, $M_{\alpha,i} \prec \mathfrak{H}$.*

Definition 3.2.11. Given a long λ-approximation sequence $(M_\beta)_{\beta<\eta}$, $\alpha < \eta$, and $i < \urcorner(\alpha)$:

- $I_i^*(\alpha) = I_i(\alpha) \cap M_\alpha$
- $\mathcal{I}_i^*(\alpha) = \mathcal{I}_i(\alpha) \cap M_\alpha$
- $M_{\alpha,i}^* = M_{\alpha,i} \cap M_\alpha$

[21] Every topological base $\mathcal{A}$ of a homogeneous dyadic compact Hausdorff space X contains a base $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that each $U \in \mathcal{B}$ has only finitely many supersets in $\mathcal{B}$.

Observation 3.2.12.

- $I_i(\alpha), \mathcal{I}_i(\alpha), M_{\alpha,i} \in M_\alpha$
- $\mathcal{I}_i^*(\alpha) = \{M_\beta \mid \beta \in I_i^*(\alpha)\}$
- $M_{\alpha,i}^* = \bigcup \mathcal{I}_i^*(\alpha)$

Corollary 3.2.13. *Every $\mathcal{I}_i^*(\alpha)$ is also directed. Hence, $M_{\alpha,i}^* \prec \mathfrak{H}$. Moreover, if $n < \omega$ and $\alpha \leq \lambda^{+n}$, then the set $\{M_\beta \mid M_\beta \subsetneq M_\alpha\}$ is a union of at most $n+1$ directed sets.*

Proof. Since M_α agrees with $\mathfrak{H}$ that $\mathcal{I}_i(\alpha)$ is directed, the set $\mathcal{I}_i^*(\alpha)$ is also directed. If $\alpha \leq \lambda^{+n}$, then there at at most $(n+1)$-many $i < \beth(\alpha)$. □

Thus, the Fundamental Lemma allows us to reduce the global task of building a direct limit Boolean algebra of size $\aleph_n$ to the local task of amalgamating n or fewer countable direct limits of countable Boolean algebras. The above Corollary also suggests a resemblance between Davies sequences and (λ, n)-morasses. Of course, Davies sequences exist in ZFC, so we cannot expect the strong coherence properties of a morass. However, the coherence available is sufficient for this paper. In particular, we have the following surprising lemma.

Definition 3.2.14. Given a long λ-approximation sequence $(M_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$ and $E \in \mathcal{P}_+(\alpha)$, let

$$E^- = \left\{ \beta < \alpha \mid M_\beta \subset \bigcap_{\gamma \in E} M_\gamma \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.2.15. *Given $\vec{M}$ and E as above, $\{M_\beta \mid \beta \in E^-\}$ is directed and $\bigcap_{\beta \in E} M_\beta = \bigcup_{\beta \in E^-} M_\beta$.*

Proof. See Lemma 2.12 in [12] and its short proof. □

Definition 3.2.16. Given a long λ-approximation sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$, $\alpha < \eta$, and $s \subset \beth(\alpha)$:

- $M_{\alpha.s}^{\cup} = \bigcup_{i \in s} M_{\alpha,i}$.
- $M_{\alpha.s}^{\cap}$ is $H(\theta)$ if $s = \varnothing$ else $\bigcap_{i \in s} M_{\alpha,i}$.
- $M_{\alpha.s}^{\cup *} = M_{\alpha,s}^{\cup} \cap M_\alpha$.
- $M_{\alpha.s}^{\cap *} = M_{\alpha,s}^{\cap} \cap M_\alpha$.

Corollary 3.2.17.

(1) *Given a long λ-approximation sequence sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$, $\alpha \leq \eta$, and $s \in \mathcal{P}_+(\beth(\alpha))$, there exists $D \subseteq \alpha$ such that $M_{\alpha,s}^{\cap} = \bigcup_{\beta \in D} M_\alpha$ and $\{M_\alpha \mid \alpha \in D\}$ is directed.*

(2) *If also $\alpha < \eta$, there then exists $D' \subseteq \alpha \cap M_\alpha$ such that $M_{\alpha,s}^{\cap *} = \bigcup_{\beta \in D'} M_\alpha$ and $\{M_\alpha \mid \alpha \in D'\}$ is directed.*

Proof. It suffices to show that (1) holds, for if it does and $\alpha < \eta$, then $D' = D \cap M_\alpha$ witnesses (2) for some $D \in M_\alpha$ because M_α agrees with $\mathfrak{H}$ that some D witnesses (1). Let $P = \prod_{i \in s} I_i(\alpha)$. For each $p \in P$, let $E(p) = \mathrm{ran}(p)^-$. By Ordering, $\sup(E(p)) \leq \min(p) < \alpha$. Order P by $p \leq q$ iff $M_{p(i)} \subset M_{q(i)}$ for all i; observe that $p \leq q$ implies $E(p) \subset E(q)$. Letting $D = \bigcup_{p \in P} E(p)$, we have $M_{\alpha,s}^{\cap} = \bigcup_{\beta \in D} M_\alpha$. By the Fundamenal Lemma, $\{E(p) \mid p \in P\}$ is directed. Hence, $\{M_\alpha \mid \alpha \in D\}$ is directed. □

Lemma 3.2.15 is proved using the tool of $\vec{M}$-rank.

Definition 3.2.18. Given a long λ-approximation sequence $\vec{M}$ and $x \in \bigcup \vec{M}$, the *$\vec{M}$-rank* $\rho(x, \vec{M})$ of x is the least α for which $x \in M_\alpha$. We write $\rho(x)$ for $\rho(x, \vec{M})$ when safe to do so.

Lemma 3.2.19 ([12, Lem. 2.11])**.** *Given a long λ-approximation sequence $\vec{M}$ and $x \in M_\alpha$, we have $M_{\rho(x)} \subset M_\alpha$.*

Lemmas 3.2.21 and 3.2.22 below are additional nice applications of $\vec{M}$-rank.

Lemma 3.2.20. *If $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$ is a long λ-approximation sequence and $\alpha < \eta$, then there exists $x \in M_\alpha$ such that $\rho(x) = \alpha$.*

Proof. Since $\exists x \notin \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} M_\beta$ is true in $\mathfrak{H}$, it is also true in M_α. □

Lemma 3.2.21. *If $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$ is a long λ-approximation sequence, $B \subset \eta$, and $M_\alpha \subset \bigcup_{\beta\in B} M_\beta$, then $M_\alpha \subset M_\beta$ for some $\beta \in B$.*

Proof. Choose $x \in M_\alpha$ such that $\rho(x) = \alpha$. Choosing $\beta \in B$ such that $x \in M_\beta$, we have $M_\alpha = M_{\rho(x)} \subset M_\beta$. □

Lemma 3.2.22. *If $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$ is a long λ-approximation sequence, $\alpha < \eta$, $D \subseteq \eta$, and $\{M_\beta \mid \beta \in D\}$ is directed, then at least one of the following holds.*

- *$M_\alpha \subset \bigcup_{\beta\in D} M_\beta$.*
- *$M_\alpha \cap \bigcup_{\beta\in D} M_\beta \subset M^*_{\alpha,i}$ for some $i < \neg(\alpha)$.*

Proof. Let $E = \left\{\beta \;\middle|\; M_\beta \subset M_\alpha \cap \bigcup_{\beta\in D} M_\beta\right\}$, which is a subset of $(\alpha+1) \cap M_\alpha$ by Ordering (3.2.5). Let $\mathcal{E} = \{M_\beta \mid \beta \in E\}$.

Claim. $\mathcal{E}$ is directed.

Proof. Given $\beta, \gamma \in E$, we have $\varepsilon \leq \alpha$ where $\varepsilon = \rho(\{\beta, \gamma\})$. Also, $\varepsilon \in M_\alpha$ by elementarity. Hence, by Ordering, $M_\beta, M_\gamma \subset M_\varepsilon \subset M_\alpha$. Choosing $\delta \in D$ such that $M_\beta, M_\gamma \subset M_\delta$, we have $M_\varepsilon \subset M_\delta$ by Lemma 3.2.19. Therefore, $\varepsilon \in E$. □

If $\alpha \in E$, then the Lemma is proved. So, assuming $\alpha \notin E$, partition $\mathcal{E}$ into $\mathcal{E}_i = \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{I}^*_i(\alpha)$ for $i < \neg(\alpha)$. Since $\mathcal{E}$ is directed, at least one $\mathcal{E}_i$ is cofinal in $\mathcal{E}$. □

The following coherence lemma is easy but also very useful.

Lemma 3.2.23. *Given a long λ-approximation sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$, $\alpha < \eta$, and $i < j < \neg(\alpha)$, we have $M_{\alpha,i} \in M^*_{\alpha,j}$.*

Proof. Since $M_{\alpha,i} \in M_\alpha$, it suffices to show that $M_{\alpha,i} \in M_{\alpha,j}$. Let $\beta = \lfloor\alpha\rfloor_j$. Since $\lfloor\alpha\rfloor_i = \lfloor\beta\rfloor_i$ and $\beta \in I_j(\alpha)$, we have $M_{\alpha,i} \in M_\beta \subset M_{\alpha,j}$. □

The next two lemmas are also easy and useful.

Lemma 3.2.24 ([12, Lem 2.3])**.** *If $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$ is a long λ-approximation sequence, $S \in M_0$, and $|S| \leq \eta$, then $S \subset \bigcup_{\alpha<\eta} M_\alpha$.*

Lemma 3.2.25. *Given a long λ-approximation sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\beta<\alpha}$ and $i < j < \neg(\alpha)$, we have $|M_{\alpha,i}| \geq \lambda$ and $|M_{\alpha,i}| > |M_{\alpha,j}|$.*

Proof. For each $k < \daleth(\alpha)$, we have $|M_{\alpha,k}| = |\partial_k\alpha|$ if $\partial_k\alpha \geq \lambda$, and, since λ is regular, $|M_{\alpha,k}| < \lambda$ if $\partial_k\alpha < \lambda$. Since $|\partial_i\alpha| > |\partial_j\alpha|$ for all $i < j < \daleth(\alpha)$ and $\partial_i\alpha \geq \lambda$ for all $i < \daleth(\alpha) - 1$, the Lemma follows. □

The key to proving the Fundamental Lemma (3.2.10) is finding within a long λ-approximation sequence $\vec{M}$ many segments that are also long λ-approximation sequences. The relevant segments arise from the following lemma, which is yet another coherence property of long λ-approximation sequences.

Lemma 3.2.26. *If $(M_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$ is a long λ-approximation sequence and $i < \daleth(\alpha)$, then $(N_\beta)_{\beta<\partial_i\alpha}$ where $N_\beta = M_{\lfloor\alpha\rfloor_i+\beta}$ is also a long λ-approximation sequence.*

Proof. Given $\beta < \partial_i\alpha$, it suffices to show that $(N_\delta)_{\delta<\beta} \in N_\beta$. Letting $\gamma = \lfloor\alpha\rfloor_i + \beta$, we have $\lfloor\gamma\rfloor_i = \lfloor\alpha\rfloor_i$. Hence, $\lfloor\alpha\rfloor_i \in M_\gamma$; hence, $(M_\delta \mid \lfloor\alpha\rfloor_i \leq \delta < \gamma) \in M_\gamma$; hence, $(N_\delta)_{\delta<\beta} \in N_\beta$. □

Corollary 3.2.27. *If $(M_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$ is a long λ-approximation sequence and $i < \daleth(\alpha)$, then $\partial_i\alpha \subset M_{\alpha,i}$.*

In Section 4, we will need the following independence phenomenon.

Lemma 3.2.28. *Given a long λ-approximation sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$, $\alpha < \eta$, and a partition $\{s,t\}$ of $\daleth(\alpha)$, we then have $M^{\cap *}_{\alpha,s} \not\subset M^{\cup}_{\alpha,t}$.*

Proof. If $x_i \in M^{\cap *}_{\alpha,s} \setminus M_{\alpha,k}$ for each $k \in t$, then $(x_k)_{k\in t} \in M^{\cap *}_{\alpha,s} \setminus M^{\cup}_{\alpha,t}$. Therefore, given $k \in t$, it suffices to show that $M^{\cap *}_{\alpha,s} \not\subset M_{\alpha,k}$. Since $M^{\cap}_{\alpha,s}, M_{\alpha,k} \in M_\alpha$, it suffices to show that $M^{\cap}_{\alpha,s} \not\subset M_{\alpha,k}$. If $s = \varnothing$, then $M^{\cap}_{\alpha,s} = H(\theta) \not\subset M_{\alpha,k}$. Therefore, we may assume there exists $j = \max(s)$ and that $M^{\cap}_{\alpha,r} \not\subset M_{\alpha,k}$ where $r = s \setminus \{j\}$.

Case $j > k$: By Lemma 3.2.23, $M^{\cap}_{\alpha,r}, M_{\alpha,k} \in M_{\alpha,j}$. Therefore, our inductive hypothesis $M^{\cap}_{\alpha,r} \not\subset M_{\alpha,k}$ is true in $M_{\alpha,j}$. Hence, $M^{\cap}_{\alpha,r} \cap M_{\alpha,j} \not\subset M_{\alpha,k}$.

Case $j < k$: By Corollary 3.2.27, for each $i \in s$, $M_{\alpha,i} \supset \partial_i\alpha$. Moreover,

$$\lambda \leq |\partial_i\alpha| > |\partial_k\alpha| = |I_k(\alpha)|.$$

Hence, $|\partial_j\alpha| > |M_{\alpha,k}|$. Since $\partial_j\alpha = \min_{i\in s}\partial_i\alpha$, we obtain $M^{\cap}_{\alpha,s} \not\subset M_{\alpha,k}$. □

3.3. **Boolean λ-complexes.**

Definition 3.3.1. $S \Subset T$ means that $S \subset T$ and $|S| \leq |T \setminus S|$.

Definition 3.3.2. A *Boolean λ-complex* of length α is a pair $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ such that $\vec{M}$ is a long λ-approximation sequence of length $\alpha+1$ and $\vec{A}$ is a sequence of Boolean algebras of length α such that:

- (BC$_1$) $A_\beta \Subset M_\beta$ for all $\beta < \alpha$.
- (BC$_2$) $A_\beta \cap \bigcup_{\gamma<\beta} M_\gamma \subset A_\beta \cap \bigcup_{\gamma<\beta} A_\gamma$ for all $\beta < \alpha$.
- (BC$_3$) $A_\gamma \leq A_\beta$ for all pairs $M_\gamma \subset M_\beta$.

The definition of Boolean λ-complex is inspired by properties (1)–(3) from Section 5 of [12], where a Boolean algebra of size $\aleph_2$ is constructed as a direct limit of countable Boolean algebras. Actually, it is required in [12] that $A_\beta \in M_\beta$, but this is an error. In that construction, $A_\beta \in M_\beta$ entails $M_\beta \cap \beta \in M_\beta$, which is impossible for $\beta \geq \omega_1$. Fortunately, if $A_\beta \in M_\beta$ is weakened to $A_\beta \Subset M_\beta$ then the construction there works otherwise unchanged.

The construction in [12] used binary pushouts to amalgamate at stages α where $\daleth(\alpha) = 2$. Our primary goal for this section is to prove a sufficient condition for

amalgamation at stages α where $\daleth(\alpha) \geq 3$. Along the way, we prove our promised new characterizations of the λ-FN.

Example 3.3.3. Given a long λ-approximation sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta+1}$ and a Boolean algebra $B \in M_0$, if we declare $A_\alpha = B \cap M_\alpha$ for each $\alpha < \eta$, then $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ is a Boolean λ-complex.

Definition 3.3.4. Given B, $\vec{M}$, and $\vec{A}$ as above, we say that $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ is *induced* by B and $\vec{M}$.

Lemma 3.3.5. *If $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ is a Boolean λ-complex and $x \in \bigcup \vec{A}$, then $\rho(x)$ is the least β for which $x \in A_\beta$.*

Proof. Let β be least such that $x \in A_\beta$. By (BC_1), $x \in M_\beta$. Therefore, given $\gamma < \beta$, it suffices to show that $x \notin M_\gamma$. But if $x \in M_\gamma$, then, by (BC_2), $x \in A_\delta$ for some $\delta < \beta$, in contradiction with our choice of β. □

By the following lemma, if $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ is a Boolean λ-complex, then the map $M_\alpha \mapsto A_\alpha$ extends to a complete lattice homomorphism with respect to intersection and union.

Lemma 3.3.6. *If $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ is a Boolean λ-complex then $A_\alpha \cap M_\beta = A_\alpha \cap A_\beta$.*

Proof. By (BC_1), it suffices to show that $A_\alpha \cap M_\beta \subset A_\beta$. Suppose $x \in A_\alpha \cap M_\beta$. By Lemma 3.2.19, $M_{\rho(x)} \subset M_\beta$. Hence, $x \in A_{\rho(x)} \subset A_\beta$ by Lemma 3.3.5 and by (BC_3). □

By the next lemma, if $\vec{A}$ is injective then the above complete lattice homomorphism is actually an isomorphism.

Lemma 3.3.7. *If $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ is a Boolean λ-complex and $A_\alpha \subsetneq A_\beta$, then $M_\alpha \subsetneq M_\beta$.*

Proof. Suppose $x \in A_\beta \setminus A_\alpha$. Then $x \in A_\beta \setminus M_\alpha$ by Lemma 3.3.6. Hence, $x \in M_\beta \setminus M_\alpha$ by (BC_1). Hence, $M_\beta \not\subset M_\alpha$. Finally, $M_\alpha \subset M_\beta$ by (BC_3). □

Definition 3.3.8. Given a Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length α and $i < \daleth(\alpha)$:

$$A_{\alpha,i} = \bigcup \{A_\beta \mid \beta \in I_i(\alpha)\}$$
$$A^*_{\alpha,i} = \bigcup \{A_\beta \mid \beta \in I^*_i(\alpha)\}$$

Since $\mathcal{I}_i(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{I}^*_i(\alpha)$ are directed, the unions in the above definition are directed unions. Therefore, endowing $A^*_{\alpha,i}$ and $A_{\alpha,i}$, with the appropriate directed unions of Boolean operators, we have $A^*_{\alpha,i} \leq A_\alpha$ and we have $A_{\alpha,i}$, together with Boolean embeddings $\mathrm{id}\colon A_\beta \to A_{\alpha,i}$ for $\beta \in I_i(\alpha)$, the direct limit of the Boolean embeddings $\mathrm{id}\colon A_\gamma \to A_\beta$ for $\beta \in I_i(\alpha)$ and $\gamma \in I_i(\alpha) \cap (\beta+1) \cap M_\beta$.

Lemma 3.3.9. $A^*_{\alpha,i} = A_{\alpha,i} \cap M_\alpha$.

Proof. Suppose $x \in A^*_{\alpha,i}$ and $y \in A_{\alpha,i} \cap M_\alpha$. We will prove $x \in M_\alpha$ and $y \in A^*_{\alpha,i}$. By definition, $x \in A_\beta$ for some $\beta \in \alpha \cap M_\alpha$. Hence, $x \in M_\beta \subset M_\alpha$. As for y, since M_α agrees with $\mathfrak{H}$ that $y \in M_\gamma$ for some $\gamma \in I_i(\alpha)$, we have $y \in M_\gamma$ for some $\gamma \in I_i(\alpha) \cap M_\alpha$. We also have $y \in A_\delta$ for some $\delta \in I_i(\alpha)$. Hence, by Lemma 3.3.6, $y \in A_\gamma \subset A^*_{\alpha,i}$. □

Definition 3.3.10. Given a Boolean algebra A, we say that A has the λ-FN iff there exists a club $\mathcal{C} \subset [A]^{<\lambda}$ such that $B \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$ for all $B \in \mathcal{C}$.

If $\lambda = \aleph_1$, then the binary λ-FN is the WFN by Theorem 1.2.10.

Lemma 3.3.11 ([3, Prop. 3.1])**.** *A Boolean algebra A has the λ-FN iff there exists $f\colon A \to [A]^{<\lambda}$ such that $f(x) \cap f(y) \cap [x,y] \neq \varnothing$ if $[x,y] \neq \varnothing$.*

Theorem 3.3.12. *Given a Boolean algebra A and a long λ-approximation sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha \leq |A|}$ such that $A \in M_0$, the following are equivalent.*

1. *A has the λ-FN.*
2. *There is a club $\mathcal{D} \subset [A]^{<\lambda}$ such that $B \mathbin{\downarrow} C$ for all $B, C \in \mathcal{D}$.*
3. *If $A \in N_i \prec \mathfrak{H}$ and $N_i \cap [H(\theta)]^{<\lambda} \subset [N_i]^{<\lambda}$ for each $i < 2$, then $(A \cap N_0) \mathbin{\downarrow} (A \cap N_1)$.*
4. *If $A \in N_i \prec \mathfrak{H}$, $N_i \cap [H(\theta)]^{<\lambda} \subset [N_i]^{<\lambda}$, and $|N_i| < \lambda$ for each $i < 2$, then $(A \cap N_0) \mathbin{\downarrow} (A \cap N_1)$.*
5. *In the induced Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$, $A_\alpha \mathbin{\downarrow} A_\beta$ for all $\alpha, \beta < |A|$.*
6. *In the induced Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$, $A_{\alpha,i} \mathbin{\downarrow} A_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < |A|$ and $i < \neg(\alpha)$.*

Proof. (1)⇒(2): Let f be as in Lemma 3.3.11. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the club of all f-closed subalgebras of A of size $< \lambda$. Suppose $\mathcal{D} \ni B \ni x \leq y \in C \in \mathcal{D}$. Then $x \leq z \leq y$ for some $z \in f(x) \cap f(y)$. Since B and C are f-closed, we have $z \in B \cap C$. By Interpolation (2.2.6), $B \mathbin{\downarrow} C$.

(2)⇒(3): The $\sqsubset_\theta$-least $\mathcal{D}$ satisfying (2) is in each N_i. Hence, $A \cap N_i = \bigcup(\mathcal{D} \cap N_i)$. By Continuity (2.3.12), $(A \cap N_0) \mathbin{\downarrow} (A \cap N_i)$.

(3)⇒(4)⇒(5): Trivial.

(5)⇒(6): Apply Continuity (2.3.12).

(5)⇒(1): First, we construct $f\colon A \to [A]^{<\lambda}$ by induction on $\vec{M}$-rank. Given $x \in A$, let $\alpha = \rho(x)$, which exists by Lemma 3.2.24, and

$$f(x) = A_\alpha \cup \bigcup_{i < \neg(\alpha)} \bigcup f[A^*_{\alpha,i}].$$

Inductively assuming $|f(y)| < \lambda$ for all y where $\rho(y) < \rho(x)$, we obtain $|f(x)| < \lambda$ by regularity of λ. This completes the construction of f. Now suppose $x \leq y$ in A. We will prove that $[x,y] \cap f(x) \cap f(y)$ is nonempty by induction on $\max(\rho(x), \rho(y))$.

Case $\rho(x) = \rho(y)$: $x \in [x,y] \cap f(x) \cap f(y)$.

Case $\rho(x) < \rho(y)$: Set $\alpha = \rho(y)$ and choose $i < \neg(\alpha)$ such that $x \in A_{\alpha,i}$. By Interpolation (2.2.6), there exists $z \in A^*_{\alpha,i}$ such that $x \leq z \leq y$. By our inductive hypothesis, there exists $w \in [x,z] \cap f(x) \cap f(z)$. By construction, $w \in [x,y] \cap f(y)$ too.

Case $\rho(x) > \rho(y)$: Apply the previous case to the pair $-y, -x$. □

3.4. **Amalgamation in Boolean λ-complexes.**

Definition 3.4.1. Given a Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length η:

- $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ *commutes* if:

(BC_4) $\bigdownarrow(A^*_{\alpha,i})_{i<\neg(\alpha)}$ in A_α for all $\alpha < \eta$.

- $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ *locally commutes* if $\bigdownarrow(A_\beta)_{\beta \in F}$ in A_α for all $\alpha < \eta$ and finite $F \subset (\alpha + 1) \cap M_\alpha$.

Lemma 3.4.2 (Local Commutativity)**.** *Every commuting Boolean λ-complex locally commutes.*

Proof. Let $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ be a commuting Boolean λ-complex of length η, let $\alpha < \eta$, and let $F \subset (\alpha+1) \cap M_\alpha$ be finite. We will prove $\bigcup(A_\beta)_{\beta\in F}$ by induction on α. Suppose that $U_\beta \in \mathrm{Ult}(A_\beta)$ and $U_\beta \cap A_\gamma = U_\gamma \cap A_\beta$ for all $\beta, \gamma \in F$. It suffices to find $V \in \mathrm{Ult}(A_\alpha)$ extending each U_β. By Ordering, if $\alpha \in F$, then $A_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta\in F} A_\beta$, in which case $\bigcup_{\beta\in F} A_\beta$ trivially. Therefore, assuming $\alpha \notin F$, it suffices to find $\vec{V} \in \prod_{i<\neg(\alpha)} \mathrm{Ult}(A^*_{\alpha,i})$ such that $V_i \cap A_\beta = U_\beta \cap A^*_{\alpha,i}$ for each $i < \neg(\alpha)$ and $\beta \in F$. Since each $A^*_{\alpha,i}$ is the directed union of $\{A_\delta \mid \delta \in I^*_i(\alpha)\}$, it suffices to show that, given $\delta \in \alpha \cap M_\alpha$, a finite $G \subset \alpha \cap M_\alpha$, $V_\beta \in \mathrm{Ult}(A_\beta)$ for $\beta \in G$, and $V_\beta \cap A_\gamma = V_\gamma \cap A_\beta$ for all $\beta, \gamma \in G$, that there exists $W \in \mathrm{Ult}(A_\delta)$ such that $W \cap A_\beta = V_\beta \cap A_\delta$ for all $\beta \in G$. For each $\beta \in G$, let $B_\beta = A_\beta \cap A_\delta$. By Lemmas 3.2.15 and 3.3.6, $B_\beta = \bigcup_{\gamma\in\{\beta,\delta\}^-} A_\gamma$. By our inductive hypothesis, if $\gamma(\beta) \in \{\beta,\delta\}^-$ for each $\beta \in G$, then $\bigcup(A_{\gamma(\beta)})_{\beta\in G}$ in A_δ. Hence, by Continuity (2.3.12), $\bigcup(B_\beta)_{\beta\in G}$ in A_δ. Hence, there exists $W \in \mathrm{Ult}(A_\delta)$ extending $V_\beta \cap A_\delta$ for each $\beta \in G$. □

Definition 3.4.3. Given a Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length η, $\alpha \leq \eta$, and $s \subset \neg(\alpha)$ such that $s \neq \varnothing$ or $\alpha < \eta$:

$$A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,s} = \begin{cases} \bigcap_{i\in s} A^*_{\alpha,i} & : s \neq \varnothing \\ A_\alpha & : s = \varnothing \text{ and } \alpha < \eta \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.4.4. *Given a locally commuting Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length η, $\alpha \leq \eta$, and $s(0), \ldots, s(n-1) \in \mathcal{P}_+(\neg(\alpha))$:*

(1) *If $\alpha < \eta$, then $\bigcup \left(A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,s(k)}\right)_{k<n}$ in A_α.*
(2) *If $j \in \bigcap_{k<n} s(k)$, then $\bigcup \left(A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,s(k)}\right)_{k<n}$ in $A^*_{\alpha,j}$.*

In particular, $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ commutes.

Proof. By Corollary 3.2.17, for each $k < n$ there exists $D(k) \subset \alpha \cap M_\alpha$ such that $A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,s(k)} = \bigcup_{\beta\in D(k)} A_\beta$. Suppose $d \in \prod D$. In Case (2), choose $\beta \in I^*_j(\alpha)$ such that $M_{d(k)} \subset M_\beta$ for all k. By hypothesis, $\bigcup(A_{d(k)})_{k<n}$, in A_α in Case (1) and in A_β in Case (2). Hence, $\bigcup(A_{d(k)})_{k<n}$ in $A^*_{\alpha,j}$ in Case (2). Hence, by Continuity (2.3.12), $\bigcup(A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,s(k)})_{k<n}$ in A_α in Case (1) and in $A^*_{\alpha,j}$ in Case (2). □

Definition 3.4.5. Given overlapping Boolean algebras $A_0, \ldots, A_{n-1}$:

- A set M *equationally reflects* $(A_i)_{i<n}$ if, for every well-defined finite system of equations γ with variables $v_0, \ldots, v_{N-1}$, if
  - the operators appearing in γ are Boolean operators from the algebras $A_0, \ldots, A_{n-1}$,
  - the constants in γ are from $M \cap \bigcup \vec{A}$, and
  - there is a solution of the form $\vec{v} = \vec{x} \in \prod_{k<N} A_{t(k)}$ where $t(k) < n$,

  then there is a solution of the form $\vec{v} = \vec{x} \in \prod_{k<N}(A_{t(k)} \cap M)$.
- We say that $\vec{A}$ is *equationally reflecting* if A_m equationally reflects $(A_i)_{i<m}$ for each $m < n$.

In the terminology of model theory, equational reflection is elementarity with respect to positive Σ_1 formulas.

Lemma 3.4.6. *Assuming M equationally reflects $(A_i)_{i<n}$, M also commutatively reflects $\vec{A}$.*

Proof. We prove (1)–(3) from Definition 2.5.1.

(1) In A_i, separately apply equational reflection to every equation $v = t$ where v is a variable and t is a Boolean combination of elements of $A_i \cap M$.

(2) By Witnessing (2.2.4), given $\vec{x} \in \prod_{i<n}(A_i \cap M)$ satisfying $\bigwedge_{i<n} \boxplus_i(x_i) = 0$, it suffices to show that $\vec{x}$ has an incompatibility witness $(\vec{z}, t, s)$ where $z_k \in \bigcap_{e<2}(A_{t(k,2)} \cap M)$. But Witnessing implies that $\vec{x}$ has an incompatibility witness $((z_k)_{k<m}, t, s)$ where $z_k \in \bigcap_{e<2} A_{t(k,2)}$. By equational reflection, $\vec{x}$ also has an incompatibility witness $((z'_k)_{k<m}, t, s)$ where $z'_k \in \bigcap_{e<2}(A_{t(k,2)} \cap M)$.

(3) Suppose $i < n$ and $\boxplus_i(a) = \bigvee_{l<N} \bigwedge_{j<n} \boxplus_j(b_{l,j})$ where $b_{l,j} \in A_l \cap M$. This equation is equivalent the pair of equations

$$0 = \boxplus_i(-a) \wedge \bigvee_{l<N} \bigwedge_{j<n} \boxplus_j(b_{l,j})$$

$$0 = \boxplus_i(a) \wedge \bigvee_{f\colon N\to n} \bigwedge_{l<N} \boxplus_{f(l)}(-b_{l,f(l)})$$

which in turn is equivalent to the finite system γ given by

$$\forall(l < N) \quad 0 = \bigwedge_{j<n} \boxplus_j(c_{l,j})$$

$$\forall(f\colon N \to n) \quad 0 = \bigwedge_{j<n} \boxplus_j(d_{f,j})$$

where $c_{l,j}$ is $b_{l,j} \wedge -a$ if $j = i$ else $b_{l,j}$ and $d_{f,j}$ is $e_{f,j} \wedge a$ if $j = i$ else $e_{f,j}$ where $e_{f,j} = \bigwedge_{f(l)=j} -b_{l,f(l)}$. By Witnessing, there is a finite system of equations Δ such that every constant is in $(M \cap \bigcup \vec{A}) \cup \{a\}$, every operator is a Boolean operator in some A_j, and γ is equivalent to the existence of a solution to Δ. Treating a as variable and then applying equational reflection to Δ, we obtain a solution to γ with $a \in A_i \cap M$. □

Definition 3.4.7. A Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length α is *retrospective* if:

(BC$_5$) $(A_\gamma)_{\gamma<\beta} \in M_\beta$ for all $\beta \leq \alpha$.

Example 3.4.8. Given a long λ-approximation sequence $\vec{M}$ and a Boolean algebra $A \in M_0$, the induced Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ is retrospective.

Lemma 3.4.9. *If $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ is a retrospective Boolean λ-complex of length α, then $(A_{\alpha,i})_{i<\neg(\alpha)}$ and $(A^*_{\alpha,i})_{i<\neg(\alpha)}$ are each commutatively reflecting.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $(A_{\alpha,i})_{i<\neg(\alpha)}$ is commutatively reflecting, for if it is, then since this sequence is in M_α, and $M_\alpha \prec \mathfrak{H}$, the sequence $(A^*_{\alpha,i})_{i<\neg(\alpha)}$ also is commutatively reflecting. By Lemma 3.4.6, it suffices to show that $(A_{\alpha,i})_{i<\neg(\alpha)}$ is equationally reflecting. Given $i < \neg(\alpha)$, we have $(A_{\alpha,j})_{j<i} \in M_{\alpha,i} \prec \mathfrak{H}$ by Lemma 3.2.23. Hence, $M_{\alpha,i}$ equationally reflects $(A_{\alpha,j})_{j<i}$. By Lemma 3.3.6, $M_{\alpha,i} \cap A_{\alpha,j} = A_{\alpha,i} \cap A_{\alpha,j}$. Hence, $A_{\alpha,i}$ also equationally reflects $(A_{\alpha,j})_{j<i}$. □

Theorem 3.4.10. *If $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ is a retrospective commuting Boolean λ-complex of length α, then there is a pushout $B = \coprod_{i<\neg(\alpha)} A^*_{\alpha,i}$ such that $A^*_{\alpha,i} \leq B$ for all $i < \neg(\alpha)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.4.4, $\bigcup(A^*_{\alpha,j} \cap A^*_{\alpha,i})_{j<i}$ for each $i < \daleth(\alpha)$. Hence, by Lemma 3.4.9, $(A^*_{\alpha,i})_{i<\daleth(\alpha)}$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 2.5.2. □

4. Some direct limits of countable algebras

4.1. **Some characterizations of projectivity.**

Definition 4.1.1. Given a Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length η, $\alpha \leq \eta$, and $s \subset \daleth(\alpha)$:

- $A^{\cup}_{\alpha.s} = \left\langle \bigcup_{i\in s} A_{\alpha,i} \right\rangle$ if $\bigcup_{i\in s} A_{\alpha,i} \subset A_{\beta,j}$ for some $\beta \leq \eta$ and $j < \daleth(\beta)$.
- $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha.s} = \left\langle \bigcup_{i\in s} A^*_{\alpha,i} \right\rangle$ if $\alpha < \eta$.

Lemma 4.1.2. *Given a retrospective Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length η, $\alpha < \eta$, and $s \subset \daleth(\alpha)$, we have $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha.s} = A^{\cup}_{\alpha,s} \cap M_\alpha$.*

Proof. $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha.s} \subset A^{\cup}_{\alpha,s} \cap M_\alpha$ is clear. For the converse, suppose that $x \in A^{\cup}_{\alpha,s} \cap M_\alpha$. Then it is true in M_α that there exists $\vec{y}$ such that $x = \bigvee_{j<n} \bigwedge_{i\in s} y_{j,i}$ and $y_{j,i} \in A_{\alpha,i}$. Hence, choosing $\vec{y}$ as above from M_α, we obtain $x \in A^{\cup *}_{\alpha.s}$. □

Theorem 4.1.3. *Given a Boolean algebra A and a Davies sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha\leq|A|}$ such that $A \in M_0$, the following are equivalent.*

1. *A is projective.*
2. *If $n < \omega$ and $A \in N_i \prec \mathfrak{H}$ for $i < n$, then $\left\langle A \cap \bigcup \vec{N} \right\rangle \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$.*
3. *If $n < \omega$, $A \in N_i \prec \mathfrak{H}$ for $i < n$, and $|N_i| > |N_j|$ and $N_i \in N_j$ for $i < j < n$, then $\left\langle A \cap \bigcup \vec{N} \right\rangle \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$.*
4. *In the induced Boolean ω_1-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$, $A^{\cup}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$ for all $\alpha < |A|$.*
5. *In the induced Boolean ω_1-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$, $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < |A|$.*

Proof. (1)⇒(2): In $\bigcap \vec{N}$, choose $(C_j)_{j\in J}$ as in Theorem 1.2.9. Then $A \cap N_i = \bigcup_{j\in J\cap N_i} C_j$ for each i. Hence,

$$\left\langle A \cap \bigcup \vec{N} \right\rangle = \left\langle \bigcup \left\{ C_j \;\middle|\; j \in J \cap \bigcup \vec{N} \right\} \right\rangle \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A.$$

(2)⇒(3): Trivial.

(3)⇒(4): For each $\alpha < |A|$ and $i < j < \daleth(\alpha)$, we have $M_{\alpha,i} \in M_{\alpha,j}$ by Lemma 3.2.23 and $|M_{\alpha,i}| > |M_{\alpha,j}|$ by Lemma 3.2.25.

(4)⇔(5): Since $A^{\cup}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)}, A \in M_\alpha \prec \mathfrak{H}$, we have

$$A^{\cup}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A \Leftrightarrow \left(A^{\cup}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)} \cap M_\alpha \right) \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} (A \cap M_\alpha).$$

By Lemma 4.1.2, $A^{\cup}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)} \cap M_\alpha = A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)}$.

(4)⇒(1) For each $\alpha < \eta$, we have $\left\langle \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} A_\beta \right\rangle \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} \left\langle \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha+1} A_\beta \right\rangle$. By Theorem 1.2.5, A is projective. □

Definition 4.1.4. Given a Tychonoff space X and sets $F \supset G$, define ${}^X p^F_G \colon X/F \to X/G$ by ${}^X p^F_G \circ q^X_F = q^X_G$.

Corollary 4.1.5. *Given a Boolean space X and a Davies sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha\leq w(X)}$ such that $X \in M_0$, the following are equivalent.*

- *X is AE(0).*

- *If $n < \omega$ and $X \in N_i \prec \mathfrak{H}$ for $i < n$, then $q^X_{\bigcup \vec{N}}$ is open.*
- *If $n < \omega$ and $X \in N_i \prec \mathfrak{H}$ for $i < n$, and $|N_i| > |N_j|$ and $N_i \in N_j$ for $i < j < n$, then $q^X_{\bigcup \vec{N}}$ is open.*
- *If $\alpha < w(X)$ and $F = M^{\cup}_{\alpha,\neg(\alpha)}$, then q^X_F is open.*
- *If $\alpha < w(X)$, $F = M_\alpha$, and $G = M^{\cup *}_{\alpha,\neg(\alpha)}$, then ${}^X p^F_G$ is open.*

Corollary 4.1.6. *Given a Boolean algebra A, the following are equivalent.*

(1) *A is projective.*
(2) *There is a club $\mathcal{C} \subset [A]^{<\aleph_1}$ such that, for all $n \in \neg_{\omega_1}[|A|]$ and $B_0, \dots, B_{n-1} \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $\left\langle \bigcup \vec{B} \right\rangle \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.2.9, (1)⇒(2). Towards proving the converse, suppose that (2) holds. By Lemma 3.2.4, there is a Davies sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha \leq |A|}$ such that $A \in M_0$. In M_0, choose $\mathcal{C}$ that is as in (2). In the induced Boolean ω_1-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$, each $A^*_{\alpha,i}$ is in $\mathcal{C}$. Hence, $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,\neg(\alpha)} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$ for all α. By Theorem 4.1.3, (1) follows. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2.14. By Stone duality, it suffices to show that a Boolean algebra A of size $\aleph_\xi$ is projective iff it has the d-ary FN where $d = \min(\omega, \xi + 1)$. This is trivially true if $\xi = 0$. For $\xi \geq 1$, we have $d = \neg_{\omega_1}[\omega_\xi]$; hence, Corollary 4.1.6 yields the desired equivalence. □

4.2. Separating FN_d and FN_{d+1}.

Definition 4.2.1. Given B a Boolean algebra and $S \subset B$, define partial functions π^S_+, π^S_- on B as follows.

$$\pi^S_+(x) = \min\{y \in S \mid y \geq x\}$$
$$\pi^S_-(x) = \max\{y \in S \mid y \leq x\}$$

Observation 4.2.2.

- *If $A \leq B$ and $\pi^A_+(x_i)$ exists for $i < n$, then $\pi^A_+(\bigvee \vec{x})$ exists and equals $\bigvee_{i<n} \pi^A_+(x_i)$.*
- *If $A \leq B$ and $x \in B$, then $\pi^A_+(x)$ exists iff $\pi^A_-(-x)$ exists.*
- *If $A \leq B$, then $A \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$ iff $\mathrm{dom}(\pi^A_+) = B$ iff $\mathrm{dom}(\pi^A_-) = B$.*

Lemma 4.2.3 (RC Reflection)**.** *If $a \in A \perp B$, then $\pi^B_+(a)$ exists iff $\pi^{A\cap B}_+(a)$ exists, and if they exist they are equal.*

Proof. Suppose $b = \pi^B_+(a)$. If $b \in A \cap B$, then $b = \pi^{A\cap B}_+(a)$. By Interpolation (2.2.6), $a \leq c \leq b$ for some $c \in A \cap B$. But then $a \leq c \in B$; hence, $a \leq b \leq c$. Therefore, $b = c \in A \cap B$, as desired.

Conversely, suppose that $c = \pi^{A\cap B}_+(a)$. Since $a \leq c \in B$, it suffices to show, given $a \leq b \in B$, that $c \leq b$. By Interpolation, $a \leq d \leq b$ for some $d \in A \cap B$. Hence, $a \leq c \leq d \leq b$. □

Lemma 4.2.4. *Given:*

- *$1 \leq d < \omega$ and $\kappa = \lambda^{+d-1}$.*
- *A commutative Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length κ.*
- *A long λ-approximation sequence $(N_\alpha)_{\alpha<\kappa}$ such that $\vec{A}, \vec{M} \in N_0$.*
- *The Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{B}, \vec{N})$ induced by $A_{\kappa,0}$.*
- *$B^{\cup *}_{\beta,d} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B_\beta$ where $\beta = \lambda^{+d-2} + \lambda^{+d-3} + \cdots + \lambda + 1$.*

We then have $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,d} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_\alpha$ *where* $\alpha = \sum_{i<d} \delta_i$ *where* $\delta_i = \sup(\lambda^{+d-1-i} \cap N_{\beta,i})$.

Proof. For each $i < d-1$ we have $\lambda^{+d-2-i} \subset N_{\beta,i}$ by Corollary 3.2.27. Hence,

$$N_{\beta,i} \cap [H(\theta)]^{<\lambda^{+d-1-i}} \subset [N_{\beta,i}]^{<\lambda^{+d-1-i}}. \tag{4.1}$$

If $i = d-1$, then (4.1) is true because $N_{\beta,i}$ is a union of sets N_γ each satisfying $N_\gamma \cap [H(\theta)]^{<\lambda} \subset [N_\gamma]^{<\lambda}$. Therefore, $\lambda^{d-1-i} \cap N_{\beta,i} = \delta_i$ for all $i < d$. Hence, if $i < d-1$, then $\lfloor \delta_i \rfloor = \delta_i$ because, by elementarity, δ_i has a cofinal set of right multiples of λ^{+d-2-i}. If $i = d-1$, then $\lfloor \delta_i \rfloor = \delta_i$ because $\delta_i < \lambda$. Therefore, for each $i < d$,

$$\partial_i \alpha = \delta_i = \lambda^{+d-1-i} \cap N_{\beta,i} = \partial_i \beta \cap N_{\beta,i}.$$

Claim. $M^*_{\alpha,i} = M_\alpha \cap N^*_{\beta,i}$ for each $i < d$.

Proof. Fixing $i < d$ for the remainder of this paragraph, we have, by Lemma 3.2.23, $\delta_j \in N^*_{\beta,i}$ for $j < i$. Also, $M_\alpha \subset N_\beta$ because $\alpha \in N_\beta$ because $\delta_j \in N_\beta$ for $j < d$ because $\partial_i \beta, N_{\beta,j} \in N_\beta$ for $j < d$. Therefore, if $\gamma \in I_i(\alpha)$, then $\gamma \in N_{\beta,i}$ because γ equals $\delta_0 + \cdots + \delta_{i-1} + \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon < \delta_i$ and so is a sum of elements of $N_{\beta,i}$. Therefore, $M^*_{\alpha,i} \subset M_\alpha \cap N^*_{\beta,i}$.

For each $i < d$, the set $\{M_\beta \mid M_\beta \subset M_\alpha \cap N_{\beta,i}\}$ is directed and $\delta_i \in M_\alpha \setminus N_{\beta,i}$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.2.22, there exists $f\colon d \to d$ such that $M_\alpha \cap N_{\beta,i} \subset M^*_{\alpha,f(i)}$. Hence,

$$M^*_{\alpha,i} \subset M_\alpha \cap N^*_{\beta,i} \subset M^*_{\alpha,f(i)}$$

for all $i < d$. By Lemma 3.2.28, we must have $f(i) = i$ for all $i < d$. □

Given $M_{\gamma(i)} \subset N^*_{\beta,i}$ for $i < d$, we have

$$\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow (A_{\gamma(0)}, \ldots, A_{\gamma(d-1)}, A_\alpha)$$

by Local Commutativity (3.4.2). By Continuity (2.3.12) and Grouping (2.3.11), it follows that $A_\alpha \mathrel{\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow} B^{\cup *}_{\beta,d}$. Therefore, $A_\alpha \cap B^{\cup *}_{\beta,d} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_\alpha$ by RC Reflection (4.2.3). By Weak Reflection (2.4.6),

$$A_\alpha \cap B^{\cup *}_{\beta,d} = \left\langle A_\alpha \cap \bigcup_{i<d} B^*_{\beta,i} \right\rangle.$$

Therefore, $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,d} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_\alpha$ by the above claim (and by Lemma 3.3.6). □

Lemma 4.2.5 ([12, Lem. 3.5])**.** *If* $A \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$*,* $a \in A$*,* $b \in B$*, and* $\pi^A_+(b) = x$*, then* $\pi^A_+(a \wedge b) = a \wedge x$.

Definition 4.2.6. A quadruple (A, B, C, D) of overlapping Boolean algebras is a *Boolean pushout square* if $A = B \cap C$ and $B \boxplus C = D$.

Lemma 4.2.7. *Given a Boolean pushout square* (A, B, C, D)*, we have* $A \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$ *iff* $C \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} D$.

Proof. $A \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B \Rightarrow C \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} D$: Since $D = \langle B \wedge C \rangle_\vee$, it suffices to show, given $b \in B$ and $c \in C$, that $\pi^C_+(b \wedge c)$ exists. By RC Reflection (4.2.3), $\pi^C_+(b) = \pi^A_+(b)$. By Lemma 4.2.5, $\pi^C_+(b \wedge c) = \pi^C_+(b) \wedge c$.

$C \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} D \Rightarrow A \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$: Given $b \in B$, $\pi^C_+(b) = \pi^A_+(b)$ by RC Reflection. □

Lemma 4.2.8. *Given overlapping Boolean algebras* A *and* B*, suppose that in* $A \boxplus B$ *we have:*

(1) $C \leq A \boxplus B$.
(2) $B \bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow C$ *and* $A \bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow B \cap C$.
(3) $B \cap C \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$ *and* $\langle A \cap (B \cup C)\rangle \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$.

Then $C \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A \boxplus B$.

Proof. Working in the algebra $A \boxplus B$ throughout, we use three Boolean pushout squares to obtain $C \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A \boxplus B$. The squares are shown in the commutative diagram below. All the morphisms shown are inclusions. However, the existence the inclusions ϕ, χ, and ψ requires proof.



Since $A \bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow B$ and $C \subset \langle A \cup B\rangle$, we have $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow(A, B, C)$ by Lemma 2.3.3. Therefore, by Weak Reflection (2.4.6),

$$C = C \cap \langle A \cup B\rangle = \langle C \cap (A \cup B)\rangle .$$

Hence, ϕ, χ, and ψ exist.

For easier reading, we abbreviate as follows.

$D = \langle A \cap (B \cup C)\rangle$
$E = \langle C \cup (A \cap B)\rangle$
$F = \langle A \cup (B \cap C)\rangle$
$G = \langle (A \cap C) \cup B\rangle$
$H = A \boxplus B$
$K = B \cap C$



Claim. (K, B, C, G) is a Boolean pushout square.

Proof. $G \subset \langle B \cup C\rangle$ and $B \bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow C$. □

Claim. (D, A, E, F) is a Boolean pushout square.

Proof. Since $F \subset \langle A \cup E\rangle$, it suffices, by Lemma 2.4.4, to show that $A \underset{D}{\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow} E$. Since $C = \langle C \cap (A \cup B)\rangle$, we have

$$E = \langle (A \cap C) \wedge (B \cap C) \wedge (A \cap B)\rangle_{\vee} .$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.4.5, it suffices, given $a \in A$, $\alpha \in A \cap C$, $\beta \in B \cap C$, and $\gamma \in A \cap B$ such that $a \perp \alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \gamma$, to find $d \in D$ such that $a \perp d \geq \alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \gamma$. Since $A \bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow (B \cap C)$ and $A \ni a \wedge \alpha \wedge \gamma \perp \beta \in B \cap C$, we have $a \wedge \alpha \wedge \gamma \perp \delta \geq \beta$ for some $\delta \in A \cap B \cap C$. Hence, $d = \alpha \wedge \delta \wedge \gamma$ is as required. □

Claim. (E, F, G, H) is a Boolean pushout square.

Proof. Since $H \subset \langle F \cup G\rangle$, it suffices, by Lemma 2.4.4, to show that $F \underset{E}{\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow} G$. First, observe that F and G are the following $\vee$-closures.

$$F = \langle A \wedge (B \cap C)\rangle_{\vee}$$
$$G = \langle (A \cap C) \wedge B\rangle_{\vee}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.4.5, it suffices, given $a \in A$, $\beta \in B \cap C$, $\alpha \in A \cap C$, and $b \in B$ such that $a \wedge \beta \perp \alpha \wedge b$, to find $e \in E$ such that $a \wedge \beta \leq e \perp \alpha \wedge b$. Since $A \downarrow B$ and $a \wedge \alpha \perp \beta \wedge b$, we may choose $\delta \in A \cap B$ such that $a \wedge \alpha \leq \delta \perp \beta \wedge b$, which implies the following inequalities.

$$a \wedge \beta \leq (\delta \vee -\alpha) \wedge \beta$$
$$\alpha \wedge b \leq \alpha \wedge (-\delta \vee -\beta)$$

Letting $e = (\delta \vee -\alpha) \wedge \beta$, we have $a \wedge \beta \leq e \in E$ and, by following computation, $e \perp \alpha \wedge b$.

$$\begin{aligned} e \wedge \alpha \wedge b &\leq [(\delta \vee -\alpha) \wedge \beta] \wedge [\alpha \wedge (-\delta \vee -\beta)] \\ &= [(\delta \vee -\alpha) \wedge \alpha] \wedge [\beta \wedge (-\delta \vee -\beta)] \\ &= \delta \wedge \alpha \wedge -\delta \wedge \beta \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$ □

Therefore, by Lemma 4.2.7, since $D \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$ and $K \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$ by hypothesis, we have $E \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} F$ and $C \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} G$. Again applying Lemma 4.2.7, we have $G \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} H$. Hence, $C \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} H$. □

It is tempting to try to weaken the hypothesis $\langle A \cap (B \cup C)\rangle \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$ in Lemma 4.2.8 to $A \cap C \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$. However, there is a strong counterexample.

Example 4.2.9. There exist overlapping Boolean algebras A and B and $C \leq A \boxplus B$ such that:

(1) A, B, and C are countably infinite and free.
(2) $\downarrow \vec{D}$ for all finite sequences $\vec{D}$ of intersections of nonempty subsets of $\{A, B, C\}$.
(3) $E \cap F \cap G \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} F \cap G \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} G$ for all permutations (E, F, G) of (A, B, C).
(4) $C \not\leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A \boxplus B$.

Proof. Let E_4 be a Boolean algebra with an independent sequence of generators $(g_n)_{n<\omega}$. Let $F_i = \langle\{g_n \mid n = i \mod 4\}\rangle$ for $i < 4$ and $E_s = \left\langle \bigcup_{i \in s} F_j \right\rangle$ for $s \subsetneq 4$. Given a pushout $D_0 \boxplus D_1$ of countably infinite free Boolean algebras D_0, D_1 meeting the six requirements itemized below, if we set $A = D_0$, $B = D_1$, and $C = E_{\{0,1,3\}}$, then we obtain (1)–(4) above.

- D_0, D_1, E_4 overlap.
- $D_i \cap E_4 = E_{\{i,2,3\}}$ for $i < 2$.
- $D_0 \cap D_1 = E_{\{2,3\}}$.
- $E_4 \leq D_0 \boxplus D_1$.
- $E_s \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} D_i$ for $i < 2$ and $s \in [\{i, 2, 3\}]^2$.
- $E_{\{0,1,3\}} \not\leq_{\mathrm{rc}} D_0 \boxplus D_1$.

To obtain D_0 and D_1, it is easier to work in the category Cpct_0. It suffices to find perfect subsets P_i of $(2^\omega)^{\{i,2,3\}} \times 3$ for $i < 2$ such that:

- $\pi^{(i)}_{\{i,2,3\}} \colon P_i \to (2^\omega)^{\{i,2,3\}}$ is surjective for $i < 2$.
- $\pi_4 \colon P_0 \boxtimes P_1 \to (2^\omega)^4$ is surjective.
- $\pi^{(i)}_s \colon P_i \to (2^\omega)^s$ is open for $i < 2$ and $s \in [\{i, 2, 3\}]^2$.
- $\pi_{\{0,1,3\}} \colon P_0 \boxtimes P_1 \to (2^\omega)^{\{0,1,3\}}$ is not open.

In the above list, we use the following notation.

- $\pi_s^{(i)}((x_i, x_2, x_3), j) = (x_k)_{k\in s}$.
- $P_0 \boxtimes P_1 = \{((x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3), (j_0, j_1)) \mid \forall i < 2 \quad ((x_i, x_2, x_3), j_i) \in P_i\}$.
- $\pi_s((x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3), (j_0, j_1)) = (x_k)_{k\in s}$.

Given $p \in 2^\omega$, let $\Delta(p) = \min(p^{-1}[\{1\}])$ where $\min(\varnothing)$ is interpreted as ∞. Define H_j for $j < 3$ and then P_i for $i < 2$ as follows.

$$H_j = \{p \mid \Delta(p) = j \mod 3\} \cup \{(0)_{n<\omega}\}$$
$$P_i = \{((x_i, x_2, x_3), j) \mid x_i + x_2 + x_3 \in H_j\}$$

Here $x + y = (x(n) +_2 y(n))_{n<\omega}$ and $+_2$ is addition modulo 2.

Each H_j and each P_i is perfect. Moreover, since $\bigcup \vec{H} = 2^\omega$, the maps π_4 and $\pi^{(i)}_{\{i,2,3\}}$ are both surjective: given $\vec{x} \in (2^\omega)^4$, we have $(\vec{x}, r) \in P_0 \boxtimes P_1$ and $(x_i, x_2, x_3, r(i)) \in P_i$ for both $i < 2$ where $x_i + x_2 + x_3 \in H_{r(i)}$ for $i < 2$. Given $i < 2$ and $\{k, l, m\} = \{i, 2, 3\}$, we have $\pi^{(i)}_{\{k,l\}}$ open because if $j < 3$, $x_k + x_l + x_m \in H_j$, $y_k \approx x_k$, and $y_l \approx x_l$, then, letting $y_m = x_k + y_k + x_l + y_l + x_m$, we obtain $y_m \approx x_m$ and $y_k + y_l + y_m \in H_j$. On the other hand, by the following claim, $\pi_{\{0,1,3\}}$ is not open at $(((0)_{n<\omega})_{k<4}, (i)_{i<2})$.

Claim. Given $n < \omega$ and $y_0, y_1, y_3 \in 2^\omega$ such that $\Delta(y_0) = 3n + 2$, $\Delta(y_1) > 3n + 2$, and $\Delta(y_3) > 3n + 2$, there does not exist $y_2 \in 2^\omega$ such that $y_i + y_2 + y_3 \in H_i$ for both $i < 2$.

Proof. If $\Delta(y_2) < 3n + 2$, then $\Delta(y_i + y_2 + y_3) = \Delta(y_2)$ for both $i < 2$. If $\Delta(y_2) = 3n+2$, then $\Delta(y_1+y_2+y_3) = 3n+2$. If $\Delta(y_2) > 3n+2$, then $\Delta(y_0+y_2+y_3) = 3n+2$. In each case, there is an $i < 2$ such that $\Delta(y_i+y_2+y_3) < \infty$ and $\Delta(y_i+y_2+y_3) \neq i \mod 3$. □

□

The following lemma is a slight modification of Observation 4.1.4 from [5], which in turn is essentially the Stone Dual of Proposition 2.6 from [16].

Lemma 4.2.10. *Given:*

- $A_0 \leq A_1$.
- $\bigcup \mathcal{B}_i = A_i$.
- $B \leq A_i$ *for all* $B \in \mathcal{B}_i$.
- $B_0 \mathbin{\downarrow} B_1$ *for all* $(B_0, B_1) \in \mathcal{B}_0 \times \mathcal{B}_1$.
- $A_0 \cap B \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$ *for all* $B \in \mathcal{B}_1$.

We then have $A_0 \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_1$.

Proof. Given $b \in A_1$, choose $B \in \mathcal{B}_1$ such that $b \in B$. By Continuity (2.3.12), $A_0 \mathbin{\downarrow} B$. Therefore, by RC Reflection (4.2.3), $\mathrm{dom}(\pi_+^{A_0}) \supset B \ni b$. Thus, $A_0 \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_1$. □

Definition 4.2.11. Given $d \leq \omega$, we say that a Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length η is *d-rc* if:

(BC$_6$) $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,s} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < \eta$ and all $s \in [\beth(\alpha)]^{<d}$.

Lemma 4.2.12. *Given $d \leq \omega$, a commutative d-rc Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length η, and $r < \beth(\eta)$, we then have $B \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_{\eta,r}$ for every $B \leq A_{\eta,r}$ generated by the union of $(< d)$-many directed unions of algebras of the form A_α where $M_\alpha \subset M_{\eta,r}$.*

Proof. Let $A = A_{\eta,r}$ and let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of all directed unions as in the statement of the lemma. Given $n < d$, $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ for $i < n$, $B = \left\langle \bigcup \vec{C} \right\rangle$, and $a \in A$, it suffices to show that $\pi_+^B(a)$ exists. Letting $\alpha = \rho(a)$, we may assume $A_\alpha \not\subset C_i$ for each $i < n$, for if $a \in C_i$, then $\pi_+^B(a) = a$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.2.22, there exists $f\colon n \to \neg(\alpha)$ such that $A_\alpha \cap C_i \subset A^*_{\alpha,f(i)}$ for each $i < n$. For definiteness, choose each $f(i)$ to be least possible. For each $t \in [\neg(\alpha)]^{<d}$, let $E(t) = A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t}$ and $F(t) = \langle \bigcup \{A_\alpha \cap C_i \mid f(i) \in t\} \rangle$; observe that $F(t) \leq E(t)$. In particular, $F(s) \leq E(s)$ where $s = \operatorname{ran}(f)$. By hypothesis, there exists $b = \pi_+^{E(s)}(a)$. Therefore, $\pi_+^{F(s)}(a)$ exists iff $\pi_+^{F(s)}(b)$ exists.

By the Lemmas 3.2.21 and 3.2.10, if $M_{\beta(i)} \subset M_{\eta,r}$ for $i \leq n$, then $\bigcup_{i\leq n} M_{\beta(i)} \subset M_\gamma$ for some $\gamma \in I_r(\alpha)$. By Local Commutativity (3.4.2), it follows that $\bigfrown(M_{\beta(i)})_{i\leq n}$. Hence, by Continuity (2.3.12),

$$\bigfrown(C_0, \ldots, C_{n-1}, A_\alpha),$$

which implies $B \mathbin{\bigfrown} A_\alpha$ by Grouping (2.3.11). Hence, $B \cap A_\alpha = F(s)$ by Weak Reflection (2.4.6). Therefore, by RC Reflection (4.2.3), $\pi_+^B(a)$ exists iff $\pi_+^{F(s)}(a)$ exists; hence, $\pi_+^B(a)$ exists iff $\pi_+^{F(s)}(b)$ exists; hence, it suffices to show that $F(s) \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} E(s)$.

We inductively assume that if a is replaced by an arbitrary $a' \in A$ with lesser $\vec{M}$-rank and $\vec{C}$ is replaced by an arbitrary $\vec{C}' \in \mathcal{C}^{<d}$, then correspondingly $a' \in \bigcup \vec{C}'$ or $F'(s') \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} E'(s')$. It follows that $\operatorname{dom}(\pi_+^B)$ contains $\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} A_\beta$. Define Δ as follows.

$$\Delta = \{i \in s \mid F(\{i\}) \neq E(\{i\})\}$$

We also inductively assume that if a remains unchanged but $\vec{C}$ is replaced by $\vec{C}' \in \mathcal{C}^{<d}$ such that the corresponding Δ' is a proper subset of Δ, then again $a \in \bigcup \vec{C}'$ or $F'(s') \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} E'(s')$.

If $\Delta = \varnothing$, then $F(s) = E(s)$; assume $\Delta \neq \varnothing$. Choosing $k \in \Delta$, let $t = s \setminus \{k\}$, $X = E(t)$, and $Y = E(\{k\})$. Then $E(s) = X \boxplus Y$ by commutativity of $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ and Grouping. Let $Z = F(s)$. By Lemma 4.2.8, it suffices to show the following.

(1) $Y \mathbin{\bigfrown} Z$
(2) $X \mathbin{\bigfrown} Y \cap Z$
(3) $Y \cap Z \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} Y$
(4) $\langle X \cap (Y \cup Z) \rangle \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} X$

(1) and (2): By Lemma 3.2.15, any intersection of unions of subsets of $\{A_\beta \mid \beta < \eta\}$ is itself a union of a subset of $\{A_\beta \mid \beta < \eta\}$. Therefore, by Local Commutativity, Continuity, and Grouping, (1) and (2) hold.

(3): Given any $A_\beta \subset Y$, we have $A_\beta \subset \operatorname{dom}(\pi_+^B)$ by our first inductive hypothesis. Also, $B \mathbin{\bigfrown} A_\beta$ for the same reason $B \mathbin{\bigfrown} A_\alpha$. Therefore, $A_\beta \cap B \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_\beta$ by RC Reflection. Hence,

$$A_\beta \cap Z = A_\beta \cap A_\alpha \cap B = A_\beta \cap B \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_\beta.$$

Hence, $Y \cap Z \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} Y$ by Lemma 4.2.10.

(4): Let $W = \langle Y \cup F(t) \rangle$. By our second inductive hypothesis, $X \cap W \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} X$. Hence, it suffices to show that $\langle X \cap (Y \cup Z) \rangle = X \cap W$. Choose a bijection $g\colon m \to t$ where $m \in \omega$. Given any $G_i = A_{\beta(i)} \subset C_i$ for $i < n$ and $G_{n+j} = A_{\gamma(j)} \subset A^*_{\alpha,g(j)}$ for $j < m$, we have $\bigfrown \vec{G}$ by Local Commutativity. Hence, $\bigfrown(C_0, \ldots, C_{n-1}, X)$

by Continuity and Grouping. Hence, $X \cap Z = \left\langle X \cap \bigcup \vec{C} \right\rangle$ by Weak Reflection. Likewise, we have

$$X \cap F(t) = \left\langle X \cap \bigcup_{f(i) \in t} C_i \right\rangle.$$

If $f(i) = k$, then $X \cap C_i \subset X \cap Y$. Therefore,

$$\langle X \cap (Y \cup Z) \rangle = \left\langle (X \cap Y) \cup \bigcup_{i<n} (X \cap C_i) \right\rangle = \langle X \cap (Y \cup F(t)) \rangle .$$

We have $\perp\!\!\!\perp(Y, F(t), X)$, again thanks to Local Commutativity, Continuity, and Grouping. Hence, $X \cap W = \langle X \cap (Y \cup F(t)) \rangle$ by Weak Reflection. Therefore, $X \cap W = \langle X \cap (Y \cup Z) \rangle$. □

Lemma 4.2.13. *Given $d \leq \omega$, a commutative d-rc Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length η, and $\alpha < \eta$, we then have $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,s}$ for all pairs $t \subset s \in [\neg(\alpha)]^{\leq d}$.*

Proof. Since $\leq_{\mathrm{rc}}$ is transitive, it suffices to show that $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,s}$ given $k \in s \in [\neg(\alpha)]^{\leq d}$ and $t = s \setminus \{k\}$. By Grouping (2.3.11), $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t} \perp\!\!\!\perp A^{*}_{\alpha,k}$. Hence, by Lemma 4.2.7, it suffices to show that $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t} \cap A^{*}_{\alpha,k} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A^{*}_{\alpha,k}$. By Weak Reflection (2.4.6),

$$A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t} \cap A^{*}_{\alpha,k} = \left\langle \bigcup_{i \in t} A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{i,k\}} \right\rangle$$

and, by Lemma 3.2.13, each $A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{i,k\}}$ is a directed union of sets of the form A_β where $M_\beta \subset M^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{i,k\}}$. Therefore, $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t} \cap A^{*}_{\alpha,k} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_{\alpha,k}$ by Lemma 4.2.12. Hence, $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t} \cap A^{*}_{\alpha,k} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A^{*}_{\alpha,k}$. □

Example 4.2.14. Given $1 \leq n < \omega$, there is a Boolean algebra B with subalgebras $A_0, \ldots, A_{n-1}$ such that:

- $\vec{A}$ is independent.
- B and each A_i is countably infinite and free.
- $\left\langle \bigcup_{i \in s} A_i \right\rangle \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$ for all $s \subsetneq n$.
- $\left\langle \bigcup \vec{A} \right\rangle \not\leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$.

Proof. It suffices to find a perfect $P \subset (2^\omega)^n \times 2$ such that:

- $\pi_n \colon P \to (2^\omega)^n$ is surjective.
- $\pi_{n \setminus \{k\}} \colon P \to (2^\omega)^{n \setminus \{k\}}$ is open for all $k < n$.
- $\pi_n \colon P \to (2^\omega)^n$ is not open.

In the above we define π_s by $\pi_s(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}, i) = (x_k)_{k \in s}$ for $s \subset n$. Let K_0, K_1 be a covering of 2^ω by non-open perfect sets and let $P_i = \{\vec{x} \in (2^\omega)^n \mid \sum \vec{x} \in K_i\}$ where $(x + y)(m) = x(m) +_2 y(m)$ for $m < \omega$ where $+_2$ is addition modulo 2. Then P_0 is not open because its intersection with $\{(0)_{m<\omega}\}^{n-1} \times (2^\omega)$ is not relatively open. Hence, letting $P = \bigcup_{i<2} (P_i \times \{i\})$, the map π_n is not open. On the other hand, if $k < n$ and $s = n \setminus \{k\}$, then π_s is open because if $\sum \vec{x} \in K_i$ and $y_j \approx x_j$ for $j \in s$, then $\sum_{j<n} y_j \in K_i$ and $y_k \approx x_k$ where $y_k = x_k + \sum_{j \in s}(x_j + y_j)$. □

Definition 4.2.15. Given $A \leq B$:

- We write $A \leq_{\mathrm{sp}} B$ and say that B *perfectly splits* A if, for all finite $F \subset B$ and $U \in \mathrm{Ult}(\langle A \cup F \rangle)$, there are at least two $V \in \mathrm{Ult}(B)$ extending U.
- We write $A \leq_{\mathrm{free}} B$ and say that B *freely extends* A if $B = A \oplus F$ for some infinite free $F \leq B$.

Observation 4.2.16.

- $A \leq_{\mathrm{free}} B \Rightarrow A \leq_{\mathrm{sp}} B$.
- $A \leq_{\mathrm{free}} B \Rightarrow A \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$.[22]

The above observation has the following converse.

Lemma 4.2.17 (Sirota's Lemma [18] (see also [5, 1.4.10]))**.** *If $\langle A \cup C \rangle = B$, $|C| \leq \aleph_0$, $A \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$, and $A \leq_{\mathrm{sp}} B$, then $A \leq_{\mathrm{free}} B$.*

Example 4.2.18. Because of Sirota's Lemma, in Example 4.2.9, we actually obtain $E \cap F \cap G \leq_{\mathrm{free}} F \cap G \leq_{\mathrm{free}} G$. Similarly, in Example 4.2.14, we actually obtain $\langle \bigcup_{i \in s} A_i \rangle \leq_{\mathrm{free}} B$.

Definition 4.2.19. Given $d < \omega$ a Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length η is *d-splitting* if:

(BC_7) $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,s} \leq_{\mathrm{sp}} A_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < \eta$ and all $s \in [\neg(\alpha)]^{<d}$.

Lemma 4.2.20. *Given $d < \omega$, a d-rc d-splitting commutative Boolean ω_1-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length η, $\alpha < \eta$, $i < \neg(\alpha)$, and $s \in [\neg(\alpha) \setminus \{i\}]^{<d}$, we then have*

$$\left\langle \bigcup_{j \in s} A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{i,j\}} \right\rangle \leq_{\mathrm{free}} A^*_{\alpha,i}.$$

Proof. Let $B = \left\langle \bigcup_{j \in s} A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{i,j\}} \right\rangle$. By Lemma 4.2.12, $B \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_{\alpha,i}$. Hence, $B \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A^*_{\alpha,i}$.

Claim. $B \leq_{\mathrm{sp}} A^*_{\alpha,i}$.

Proof. Let $U \in \mathrm{Ult}(A^*_{\alpha,i})$ and let $F \leq A^*_{\alpha,i}$ be finite. It suffices to show that $U \cap \langle B \cup F \rangle$ extends to distinct $W_0, W_1 \in \mathrm{Ult}(A^*_{\alpha,i})$. Using Lemma 3.2.28, choose β such that $M_\beta \subset M^*_{\alpha,i}$ and $M_\beta \not\subseteq \bigcup_{j \in s} M_{\alpha,j}$. Using Corollary 3.2.13, choose γ such that $M_\beta \cup F \subset M_\gamma \subset M^*_{\alpha,i}$. By Local Commutativity (3.4.2) and Continuity (2.3.12), $\bigcup(C_j)_{j \in s \cup \{i\}}$ where C_j is A_γ if $j = i$ else $A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{i,j\}}$. Hence, by Weak Reflection (2.4.6), $A_\gamma \cap B = \left\langle A_\gamma \cap \bigcup_{j \in s} A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{i,j\}} \right\rangle$. Hence, by Lemmas 3.2.15 and 3.2.22, $A_\gamma \cap B \leq A^{\cup *}_{\gamma,t}$ for some $t \in [\neg(\gamma)]^{<d}$. By hypothesis, $U \cap \langle A^{\cup *}_{\gamma,t} \cup F \rangle$ extends to distinct $V_0, V_1 \in \mathrm{Ult}(A_\gamma)$. By Grouping (2.3.11) applied to $\vec{C}$, we have $A_\gamma \mathop{\bigcup} B$. Therefore, each $(U \cap B) \cup V_i$ extends to some $W_i \in \mathrm{Ult}(A^*_{\alpha,i})$. □

By Sirota's Lemma, $B \leq_{\mathrm{free}} A^*_{\alpha,i}$. □

Definition 4.2.21. Given a Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length α, $s \subset \neg(\alpha)$, and a Boolean algebra B such that $A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,s} \leq B$ for all $s \in [\neg(\alpha)]^2$, let

$$A^{2*}_{\alpha,s} = \left\langle \bigcup_{i \in s} \bigcup_{j \in \neg(\alpha) \setminus \{i\}} A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{i,j\}} \right\rangle.$$

[22] If F is as above, then, by independence, $\pi^A_+(a \wedge x) = a$ for all $a \in A$ and $x \in F$.

Definition 4.2.22. Given $1 \leq d < \omega$, a Boolean λ-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length η is *d-thick* if it is commutative, retrospective, d-rc, and d-splitting, and $\eta < \lambda^{+(d-1)}+\omega$.

Note that the least α for which $\beth_\lambda(\alpha) > d$ is $\lambda^{+(d-1)} + \lambda^{+(d-2)} + \cdots + \lambda + 1$.

Lemma 4.2.23. *Given $1 \leq d < \omega$ and a d-thick Boolean ω_1-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length α, there then are:*

1. *A pushout $P = \coprod (A^*_{\alpha,i})_{i<\beth(\alpha)}$ such that $\boxplus_i = \mathrm{id}\colon A^*_{\alpha,i} \to P$ for $i < \beth(\alpha)$.*
2. *Countably infinite free Boolean subalgebras $F_i \leq A^*_{\alpha,i}$ for $i < \beth(\alpha)$ such that, in P, for each $s \subset \beth(\alpha)$ we have*

$$A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,s} = \Big(\bigoplus\nolimits_{i\in s} F_i\Big) \oplus A^{2*}_{\alpha,s}. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.4.10, there is a pushout P as above. To obtain a d-thick Boolean ω_1-complex of length $\alpha+1$, choose a countable A_α such that $P \leq_{\mathrm{free}} A_\alpha$ and choose a countable $M_{\alpha+1} \prec \mathfrak{H}$ such that $A_\alpha, M_\alpha \in M_{\alpha+1}$, replacing (if necessary) P and A_α with isomorphic copies such that (BC_1) and (BC_2) are preserved. Note that (BC_6) is preserved by Lemma 4.2.13.

By Lemma 4.2.20, we may choose $\vec{F}$ such that (4.2) holds for all $s \subset \beth(\alpha)$ of size ≤ 1. Therefore, given $k \in s \in [\beth(\alpha)]^{\geq 2}$, it suffices to show that (4.2) holds assuming that it holds if s is replaced by any of its proper subsets. Letting $\vec{U} \in \prod_{i\in s} \mathrm{Ult}(F_i)$ and $V \in \mathrm{Ult}(A^{2*}_{\alpha,s})$, it suffices to show that $\bigcup \vec{U} \cup V$ extends to some $S \in \mathrm{Ult}(A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,s})$. Let $t = s \setminus \{k\}$, $W = V \cap A^{2*}_{\alpha,t}$, and $X = V \cap A^{2*}_{\{k\}}$. By assumption, we may extend $\bigcup_{i\in t} U_i \cup W$ to some $Y \in \mathrm{Ult}(A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t})$ and $U_k \cup X$ to some $Z \in \mathrm{Ult}(A^*_{\alpha,k})$.

For the rest of the proof, we will use Lemma 3.4.4, Grouping (2.3.11), and Weak Reflection (2.4.6) without comment. First, we compute that $A^{2*}_{\alpha,s} \cap A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t} = A^{2*}_{\alpha,t}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
A^{2*}_{\alpha,s} \cap A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t} &= \left\langle \bigcup_{l\in t} (A^{2*}_{\alpha,s} \cap A^*_{\alpha,l}) \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \bigcup_{l\in t} \bigcup_{i\in s} \bigcup_{j\in \beth(\alpha)\setminus\{i\}} A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{l,i,j\}} \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \bigcup_{l\in t} \bigcup_{j\in \beth(\alpha)\setminus\{l\}} A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{l,j\}} \right\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $V \cup Y$ extends to some $T \in \mathrm{Ult}(C)$ where $C = \langle A^{2*}_{\alpha,s} \cup A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t} \rangle$. We next compute that $A^*_{\alpha,k} \cap C = A^{2*}_{\{k\}}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
A^*_{\alpha,k} \cap C &= \langle A^*_{\alpha,k} \cap (A^{2*}_{\alpha,s} \cup A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,t}) \rangle \\
&= \left\langle \bigcup_{i\in s} \bigcup_{j\in \beth(\alpha)\setminus\{i\}} A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{k,i,j\}} \cup \bigcup_{i\in t} A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{k,i\}} \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \bigcup_{j\in \beth(\alpha)\setminus\{k\}} A^{\cap *}_{\alpha,\{k,j\}} \right\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$Z \cap C = Z \cap A^{2*}_{\{k\}} = X = V \cap A^{2*}_{\{k\}} = T \cap A^{2*}_{\{k\}} = T \cap A^*_{\alpha,k}.$$

Hence, $Z \cup T$ extends to some $S \in \mathrm{Ult}(A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,s})$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2.15. Given $1 \leq d < \omega$, we will construct a retrospective d-thick Boolean ω_1-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ of length ω_d such that $A_{\omega_d,0}$ has the FN_d but not the FN_{d+1}. Given $\alpha \leq \omega_d$, $(A_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$, and $(M_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$, we choose a countable $M_\alpha \prec \mathfrak{H}$ such that $((A_\beta, M_\beta))_{\beta<\alpha} \in M_\alpha$, thus preserving (BC_5). Given $\alpha < \omega_d$, $(A_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$, and $(M_\beta)_{\beta\leq\alpha}$, construct A_α as follows.

Applying Lemma 4.2.23, we obtain countably infinite Boolean algebras P_α and $F_{\alpha,i}$ for $i < \daleth(\alpha)$ such that:

- $F_{\alpha,i} \leq A^*_{\alpha,i} \leq P_\alpha$.
- $F_{\alpha,i}$ is free.
- $\left\langle F_{\alpha,i} \cup A^{2*}_{\alpha,\{i\}} \right\rangle = A^*_{\alpha,i}$.
- $\left\langle \bigcup_{i<\daleth(\alpha)} A^*_{\alpha,i} \right\rangle = P_\alpha$.
- $\bigdownarrow (A^*_{\alpha,i})_{i<\daleth(\alpha)}$ in P_α.
- $F_{\alpha,i(0)}, \ldots, F_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)-1}, A^{2*}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)}$ is independent in P_α.

Let $B_{\alpha,s} = \left\langle \bigcup_{i\in s} F_{\alpha,i} \right\rangle$ for $s \subset \daleth(\alpha)$. Since $\alpha < \omega_d$, we have $\daleth(\alpha) \leq d$. If $\daleth(\alpha) < d$, let $C_\alpha = B_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)}$. If $\daleth(\alpha) = d$, then extend $B_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)}$ to a countable Boolean algebra C_α such that:

(1) $B_{\alpha,s} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} C_\alpha$ for $s \in [d]^{<d}$.
(2) $B_{\alpha,d} \not\leq_{\mathrm{rc}} C_\alpha$.
(3) $C_\alpha \cap P_\alpha = B_{\alpha,d}$.

Example 4.2.14 shows that we can obtain (1) and (2). If necessary, replace C_α with an isomorphic copy also satisfying (3). Whether $\daleth(\alpha) < d$ or $\daleth(\alpha) = d$, since $A^{2*}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)}$ and $B_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)}$ are independent in P_α, we may choose a coproduct $D_\alpha = A^{2*}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)} \oplus C_\alpha$ such that its cofactor maps are inclusions and $P_\alpha \leq D_\alpha$.

Choose A_α such that $D_\alpha \leq_{\mathrm{free}} A_\alpha$, thus preserving (BC_3), (BC_4), and (BC_7). If necessary, replace P_α, C_α, D_α, and A_α with isomorphic copies such that (BC_1) and (BC_2) are also preserved. By the following claim, our construction of $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ is complete.

Claim. (BC_6) is preserved.

Proof. Suppose that $s \in [\daleth(\alpha)]^{<d}$. By Lemma 4.2.13, $A^{\cup*}_{\alpha,s} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} P_\alpha$. Since

$$A^{\cup*}_{\alpha,s} \leq A^{2*}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)} \oplus B_{\alpha,s} \leq P_\alpha,$$

we must have $A^{\cup*}_{\alpha,s} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A^{2*}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)} \oplus B_{\alpha,s}$ also. Since $B_{\alpha,s} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} C_\alpha$, we further have

$$A^{\cup*}_{\alpha,s} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A^{2*}_{\alpha,\daleth(\alpha)} \oplus C_\alpha \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_\alpha. \qquad \square$$

Let $A = A_{\omega_d,0}$. By Lemma 4.2.12, A has the FN_d. All that remains is to show that A does not have the FN_{d+1}. Suppose that $\mathcal{C} \subset [A]^{<\aleph_1}$ is a club. Let $(N_\alpha)_{\alpha<\omega_d}$ be a Davies sequence such that $\vec{M}, \mathcal{C} \in N_0$. Then $A \cap N^*_{\alpha,i} \in \mathcal{C}$ for each $\alpha < \omega_d$ and $i < \daleth(\alpha)$. Therefore, it suffices to find $\beta < \omega_d$ such that $\daleth(\beta) = d$ and $\left\langle A \cap N^{\cup*}_{\beta,d} \right\rangle \not\leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$.

Claim. If $\alpha < \omega_d$ and $\daleth(\alpha) = d$, then $A^{\cup*}_{\alpha,d} \not\leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_\alpha$.

Proof. Since $A^{\cup*}_{\alpha,d} = P_\alpha \leq D_\alpha \leq A_\alpha$, it suffices to show that $P_\alpha \not\leq_{\mathrm{rc}} D_\alpha$. Since $P_\alpha = A^{2*}_{\alpha,d} \oplus B_{\alpha,d}$, we have $B_{\alpha,d} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} P_\alpha$. Therefore, it suffices to show that

$B_{\alpha,d} \not\leq_{\mathrm{rc}} D_\alpha$. By construction, $B_{\alpha,d} \leq C_\alpha \leq D_\alpha$. Therefore, it suffices to observe that $B_{\alpha,d} \not\leq_{\mathrm{rc}} C_\alpha$. □

Therefore, by Lemma 4.2.4, $\beta = \omega_{d-1} + \omega_{d-2} + \cdots + \omega_1 + 1$ is as desired. □

5. Direct limits of commuting finite algebras

5.1. From projective to SFN_d to FN_d.

Lemma 5.1.1. *If $A \leq B \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} D \geq C$ and $\pi^B_+[C] \subset A$, then $B \cap \langle A \cup C \rangle = A$.*

Proof. Given $b = \bigvee_{i<n}(a_i \wedge c_i) \in B$ where $a_i \in A$ and $c_i \in C$, we have, by Lemma 4.2.5,

$$b = \pi^B_+(b) = \bigvee_{i<n}(a_i \wedge \pi^B_+(c_i)) \in A.$$ □

Lemma 5.1.2. *Given a Boolean algebra F, assume the following.*

- *$n < \omega$ and $B_0, \ldots, B_{n-1}, D \leq F$.*
- *$\mathring{\bigdownarrow}\vec{B}$.*
- *$A = \bigcap \vec{B}$ and $C = \left\langle \bigcup \vec{B} \right\rangle$.*
- *$\mathrm{dom}(\pi^C_+) \supset D$ and $\pi^C_+[D] \subset A$.*
- *$E_i = \langle B_i \cup D \rangle$ for $i < n$.*

We then have $\mathring{\bigdownarrow}\vec{E}$. Moreover, if $\vec{x} \in \prod \vec{E}$ and $\bigwedge \vec{x} = 0$, then $\vec{x}$ has a weak incompatibility witness $\vec{y} \in \prod_{i<n} \left\langle D \cup \bigcup_{j\neq i}(B_j \cap B_i) \right\rangle$.

Proof. Suppose that $\vec{x} \in \prod \vec{E}$ and $\bigwedge \vec{x} = 0$. It suffices to find $\vec{y}$ as claimed by the Lemma. Choose a finite $H \leq D$ such that $x_i \in \langle B_i \cup H \rangle$ for each i. Let Δ be the set of atoms of H and let $x_i = \bigvee_{d\in\Delta}(b^d_i \wedge d)$ where $b^d_i \in B_i$. We then have $d \wedge \bigwedge_{i<n} b^d_i = 0$ for each d. Hence, $d_+ \wedge \bigwedge_{i<n} b^d_i = 0$ where $d_+ = \pi^C_+[d]$. Hence, $(z^d_i)_{i<n} \in \prod \vec{B}$ and $\bigwedge_{i<n} z^d_i = 0$ where $z^d_i = b^d_i \cap d_+$. Therefore, we have some $(w^d_i)_{i<n} \in \prod_{i<n} \left\langle \bigcup_{j\neq i}(B_j \cap B_i) \right\rangle$ such that $z^d_i \leq w^d_i$ and $\bigwedge_{i<n} w^d_i = 0$. Hence, $x_i \leq y_i \in \left\langle D \cup \bigcup_{j\neq i}(B_j \cap B_i) \right\rangle$ where $y_i = \bigvee_{d\in\Delta}(w^d_i \wedge d)$. Moreover,

$$\bigwedge \vec{y} = \bigvee_{d\in\Delta} \bigwedge_{i<n} (w^d_i \wedge d) = 0$$ □

Corollary 5.1.3. *Given the hypotheses of Lemma 5.1.2, if also $n = 2$, then $E_0 \cap E_1 = \langle D \cup (B_0 \cap B_1) \rangle$.*

Proof. Let $G = \langle D \cup (B_0 \cap B_1) \rangle$. Since $n = 2$, we have, for each $i < 2$,

$$D \cup \bigcup_{j\neq i}(B_j \cap B_i) = D \cup (B_0 \cap B_1).$$

Hence, if $x \in E_0 \cap E_1$, then, for some $y_0, y_1 \in G$, we have $x \leq y_0$, $-x \leq y_1$, and $y_0 \wedge y_1 = 0$. Thus, $E_0 \cap E_1 \subset G$; the reverse inclusion is clear. □

Lemma 5.1.4. *Given a Boolean algebra F, assume the following.*

- *$m \leq n < \omega$.*
- *$B_0, \ldots, B_{n-1}, D \leq F$.*
- *$\bigdownarrow \vec{B}$.*

- $A = \bigcap \vec{B}$ *and* $C = \left\langle \bigcup \vec{B} \right\rangle$.
- $\mathrm{dom}(\pi^C_+) \supset D$ *and* $\pi^C_+[D] \subset A$.
- $E_i = \langle B_i \cup D \rangle$ *for* $i < m$ *and* $E_i = B_i$ *for* $i \in n \setminus m$.

We then have $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow \vec{E}$.

Proof. Suppose that $\vec{V} \in \prod_{i<n} \mathrm{Ult}(E_i)$, $\vec{z} \in \prod \vec{V}$, and $\bigwedge \vec{z} = 0$. We will show that $V_i \cap E_j \neq V_j \cap E_i$ for some i, j. For each $i < m$, z_i is a finite join of elements of the form $b \wedge d$ where $b \in B_i$ and $d \in D$. Hence, we may choose $b_i \in B$ and $d_i \in D$ such that $z_i \geq b_i \wedge d_i \in V_i$. Let $w = \bigwedge \vec{d}$. For each $i < m$, let $W_i = V_i \cap D$. If $w \notin W_i$ for some $i < m$, then $W_i \neq W_j$ for some $j < m$, in which case $V_i \cap E_j \neq V_j \cap E_i$. Therefore, we may assume $w \in W_i$ for all $i < m$. Let $y_i = b_i \wedge w$ for each $i < m$ and $y_i = b_i = z_i$ for each $i \in n \setminus m$. We then have $z_i \geq y_i \in V_i$ for each $i < n$.

Since $\bigwedge \vec{y} \leq \bigwedge \vec{z} = 0$, we have $\bigwedge \vec{b} \perp w$. Hence, $\bigwedge \vec{b} \perp v$ where $v = \pi^C_+(w)$. Letting $x_i = b_i \wedge v$ and $U_i = V_i \cap B_i$ for each $i < n$, we have $\bigwedge \vec{x} = 0$ and $\vec{x} \in \prod \vec{U}$. Since $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow \vec{B}$, for some i, j we have $U_i \cap B_j \neq U_j \cap B_i$ and, hence, $V_i \cap E_j \neq V_j \cap E_i$. □

Definition 5.1.5. Say that a set $\mathcal{S}$ of subalgebras of a fixed Boolean algebra *commutes well* (*commutes d-well*) if every finite tuple (every finite tuple of length $\leq d$) of elements of $\mathcal{S}$ commutes. Likewise define the analogous notions for weak commutativity.

Definition 5.1.6. For convenience, given a Davies sequence $\vec{M}$, let $M^*_{\alpha,\neg(\alpha)} = M_\alpha$.

Theorem 5.1.7. *Given a Boolean algebra* A *and a Davies sequence* $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha \leq |A|}$ *such that* $A \in M_0$*, the following are equivalent.*

(1) A *is projective.*
(2) *There is a* $\cap$*-closed cofinal family* $\mathcal{E}$ *of finite subalgebras of* A *that commutes well.*
(3) *There is a cofinal family* $\mathcal{E}$ *of finite subalgebras of* A *that commutes well.*
(4) *There is a cofinal family* $\mathcal{E}$ *of finite subalgebras of* A *that weakly commutes well.*
(5) *There is a* $\cap$*-closed cofinal family* $\mathcal{E} \in M_0$ *of finite subalgebras of* A *such that, in the induced Boolean* ω_1*-complex* $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$, $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow \vec{B}$ *for each* $\alpha < |A|$ *and* $\vec{B} \in \prod_{i \leq \neg(\alpha)} (\mathcal{E} \cap M^*_{\alpha,i})$.
(6) *There is a cofinal family* $\mathcal{E} \in M_0$ *of finite subalgebras of* A *such that, in the induced Boolean* ω_1*-complex* $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$, $\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow \vec{B}$ *for each* $\alpha < |A|$ *and* $\vec{B} \in \prod_{i \leq \neg(\alpha)} (\mathcal{E} \cap M^*_{\alpha,i})$.
(7) *There is a cofinal family* $\mathcal{E} \in M_0$ *of finite subalgebras of* A *such that, in the induced Boolean* ω_1*-complex* $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$, $\mathring{\bigcirc\!\!\!\!\!\!\downarrow} \vec{B}$ *for each* $\alpha < |A|$ *and* $\vec{B} \in \prod_{i \leq \neg(\alpha)} (\mathcal{E} \cap M^*_{\alpha,i})$.

Proof. (1)⇒(2): Let $(a_\alpha)_{\alpha<\eta}$ be as in Theorem 1.2.7. Inductively assume that $\alpha < \eta$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is a $\cap$-closed well commuting family of finite subalgebras of H where $H = \langle \{a_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \rangle$. Let $c_i = \pi^H_+((-1)^i a_\alpha)$ for each $i < 2$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{B \in \mathcal{B} \mid c_0, c_1 \in B\}$, $\mathcal{D} = \{\langle C \cup \{a_\alpha\} \rangle : C \in \mathcal{C}\}$, and $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D}$. It suffices to show that $\mathcal{E}$ is $\cap$-closed and commutes well. For each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $D = \langle C \cup \{a_\alpha\} \rangle$, we have we have $H \cap D = C$ by Lemma 5.1.1; hence, by our inductive hypothesis, $B \cap D = B \cap C \in \mathcal{B}$ for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Moreover, given $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $D_i = \langle C_i \cup \{a_\alpha\} \rangle$ for $i < 2$, we have

$D_0 \cap D_1 = \langle \{a_\alpha\} \cup (C_0 \cap C_1) \rangle$ by Corollary 5.1.3. By our inductive hypothesis, $C_0 \cap C_1 \in \mathcal{C}$; hence, $D_0 \cap D_1 \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus, $\mathcal{E}$ is $\cap$-closed.

Therefore, given a finite $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}$ and $\vec{U} \in \prod_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \mathrm{Ult}(F)$ such that $U_F \cap G = U_G \cap F$ for all $F, G \in \mathcal{F}$, it suffices to find $X \in \mathrm{Ult}(A)$ extending $\bigcup \vec{U}$. Set $V_F = U_F \cap H$ for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$. We then have $V_F \cap G = V_G \cap F$ for all $F, G \in \mathcal{F}$. Since $F \cap H \in \mathcal{B}$ for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$, we may apply our inductive hypothesis to extend $\bigcup \vec{V}$ to some $W_H \in \mathrm{Ult}(H)$. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{H\} \cup (\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{D})$ and $W_F = U_F$ for each $F \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{D}$. We then have $W_F \cap G = W_G \cap F$ for all $F, G \in \mathcal{G}$. By Lemma 5.1.4, there exists $X \in \mathrm{Ult}(A)$ extending $\bigcup \vec{W}$ and, hence, $\bigcup \vec{U}$.

(2)⇒(3) and (5)⇒(6): Trivial.

(2)⇒(5) and (3)⇒(6): In M_0, choose $\mathcal{E}$ that satisfies (2) and (3), respectively.

(3)⇔(4) and (6)⇔(7): Apply Theorem 2.4.8.

(7)⇒(1): By Grouping (2.3.11), for each α and $\vec{B}$ as in (6), we have

$$\left\langle \bigcup_{i < \neg(\alpha)} B_i \right\rangle \downarrow B_{\neg(\alpha)}.$$

Each such $B_{\neg(\alpha)}$ is finite and, hence, satisfies $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,\neg(\alpha)} \cap B_{\neg(\alpha)} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B_{\neg(\alpha)}$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.2.10, $A^{\cup *}_{\alpha,\neg(\alpha)} \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A_\alpha$. By Theorem 4.1.3, A is projective. □

Corollary 5.1.8. *Given a Boolean space X and a Davies sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha \leq w(X)}$ such that $X \in M_0$, the following are equivalent.*

1. *X is AE(0).*
2. *X is the limit in Cpct_0 of a colimit-preserving functor Ω from the poset category of a downward-directed join-semilattice J to* Fin *such that, for each finite $F \subset J$, the commutative $|F|$-cube $(\Omega(\bigvee s \to \bigvee t))_{s \subset t \subset F}$ is $|F|$-commutative.*
3. *X is the limit in Cpct_0 of a functor $\Omega \in M_0$ of a colimit-preserving functor $\Omega \in M_0$ that satisfies (2) with the quantification over F restricted to sets of the form $\mathrm{ran}(f)$ where $\alpha < w(X)$ and $f \in \prod_{i \leq \neg(\alpha)} (J \cap M^*_{\alpha,i})$.*
4. *X is the limit in Cpct_0 of a functor Ω from the poset category of a downward-directed poset J to* Fin *such that, for each finite $F \subset J$, the commutative $|F|$-cube $(\Phi^s_t \colon \Xi_s \to \Xi_t)_{s \subset t \subset F}$ is $|F|$-commutative where:*
   - *$\Xi_{\{i\}} = \Omega(i)$.*
   - *$\Xi_\varnothing = \Omega(j)$ where j is any lower bound of F.*
   - *$\Phi^\varnothing_{\{i\}} = \Omega(j \to f(i))$.*
   - *For each $t \in [|F|]^{\geq 2}$, Ξ_t together with $(\Phi^s_t)_{s \subsetneq t}$ is a colimit of $(\Phi^r_s)_{r \subset s \subsetneq t}$.*
5. *X is the limit in Cpct_0 of a functor $\Omega \in M_0$ that satisfies (4) with the quantification over F restricted to sets of the form $\mathrm{ran}(f)$ where $\alpha < w(X)$ and $f \in \prod_{i \leq \neg(\alpha)} (J \cap M^*_{\alpha,i})$.*

Proof. Apply Stone duality to Theorem 5.1.7 and note that, given Boolean algebras $A, B \leq C$, the algebra $A \cap B$ together with the inclusions $A \cap B \to A, B$ is a limit in Bool of the inclusions $A, B \to C$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3.3. By Theorem 5.1.7, projectivity implies SFN_ω. Therefore, given $d < \omega$ and A with the SFN_d, it suffices to show that A has the FN_d. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a cofinal family of finite subalgebras of A that commutes d-well. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of all unions of countable directed subsets of $\mathcal{B}$. Then $\mathcal{C}$ is a club subset of $[A]^{<\aleph_1}$.

Hence, given $n < d$ and $\mathcal{D}_i \in [\mathcal{B}]^{<\aleph_1}$ for $i < n$, it suffices to show that $C \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$ where $C = \left\langle \bigcup_{i<n} \bigcup \mathcal{D}_i \right\rangle$. Given $B \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $C \cap B \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} B$ because B is finite. Given also $\vec{D} \in \prod_{i<n} \mathcal{D}_i$, we have $\left\langle \bigcup \vec{D} \right\rangle \perp B$ by Grouping (2.3.11). Therefore, by Lemma 4.2.10, $C \leq_{\mathrm{rc}} A$. □

Corollary 5.1.9. *If A is projective, $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha \leq |A|}$ is a Davies sequence, and $A \in M_0$, then the induced Boolean ω_1-complex $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ commutes.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{E} \in M_0$ be a cofinal well commuting family of finite subalgebras of A. Then each $A^*_{\alpha,i}$ is a union of elements of $\mathcal{E}$. By Continuity (2.3.12), $(\vec{A}, \vec{M})$ commutes. □

Corollary 5.1.10. *If a Boolean algebra A has the SFN_d, then there exists a map f from A to the set of finite subalgebras of A such that:*

- *$\bigcup f[f(a)] = f(a)$ for all $a \in A$.*
- *If $n \leq d$, $\vec{x} \in A^n$, and $\bigwedge \vec{x} = 0$, then $\bigwedge \vec{y} = 0$ and $x_i \leq y_i$ for some $\vec{y} \in \prod_{i<n} \left\langle f(x_i) \cap \bigcup_{j \neq i} f(x_j) \right\rangle$.*

In particular, f is as in Theorem 1.2.18.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a $\cap$-closed cofinal family of finite subalgebras of A that commutes d-well. For each $a \in A$, let $f(a)$ be the least $B \in \mathcal{B}$ containing a. By construction, $\bigcup f[f(a)] = f(a)$ for all $a \in A$ and $\bigcup (f(x_i))_{i<n}$ for all $n \leq d$ and $\vec{x} \in A^n$. Hence, if $\vec{x}$ is as above and $\vec{x} = 0$, then, by Witnessing (2.2.4), there exist $\vec{y}$ as desired. □

Theorem 5.1.11. *Given $d \leq \omega$, a set I, and A_i with the SFN_d for $i \in I$, the coproduct $\bigoplus \vec{A}$ then also has the SFN_d.*

Proof. For each $i \in I$, let $\mathcal{B}_i$ be a d-well commuting cofinal family of finite subalgebras of A_i. Define a cofinal family $\mathcal{B}$ of finite subalgebas of $\bigoplus \vec{A}$ as follows.

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ \left\langle \bigcup_{i \in F} \oplus_i [B_i] \right\rangle \;\middle|\; F \in [I]^{<\aleph_0} \text{ and } \vec{B} \in \prod_{i \in F} \mathcal{B}_i \right\}.$$

Given $n \leq d$, finite $F(k) \subset I$ for $k < n$, and $B_{k,i} \in \mathcal{B}_i$ for $k < n$ and $i \in F(k)$, it suffices to show that $\bigcup \vec{C}$ where $C_k = \left\langle \bigcup_{i \in F(k)} \oplus_i [B_{k,i}] \right\rangle$. Suppose that $\vec{U} \in \prod_{k<n} \mathrm{Ult}(C_k)$, $\vec{x} \in \prod \vec{U}$, and $\bigwedge \vec{x} = 0$. It suffices to find $k, l < n$ such that $U_k \cap C_l \neq U_l \cap C_k$. Since $C_k = \left\langle \bigwedge_{i \in F(k)} \oplus_i [B_{k,i}] \right\rangle_\vee$, there exists $\vec{y} \in \prod \vec{U}$ such that $y_k \leq x_k$ for $k < n$ and $y_k = \bigwedge_{i \in F(k)} \oplus_i (z_{k,i})$ where $z_{k,i} \in B_{k,i}$. Hence, $\bigwedge \vec{y} = 0$ and $\oplus_i (z_{k,i}) \in U_k$. By independence, there exists $i \in \bigcup_{k<n} F(k)$ such that $\bigwedge_{F(k) \ni i} z_{k,i} = 0$. Let $V_k = \oplus_i^{-1}[U_k]$ for $k < n$ where $i \in F(k)$. By hypothesis, there exist $k, l < n$ such that $i \in F(k), F(l)$ and $V_k \cap B_{k,i} \neq V_l \cap B_{l,i}$. Hence, $U_k \cap C_l \neq U_l \cap C_k$. □

Lemma 5.1.12. *Given $\bigcup (B_i)_{i<n}$ in A and Boolean homomorphisms $R \xleftarrow{r} A \xleftarrow{e} R$ such that $r \circ e = \mathrm{id} \colon R \to R$, we then have $\bigcup_{i<n} r[B_i]$ in R.*

Proof. Let $C_i = r[B_i]$ for $i < n$. Given $\vec{V} \in \prod_{i<n} \mathrm{Ult}(C_i)$, $\vec{y} \in \prod \vec{V}$, and $\bigwedge \vec{y} = 0$, it suffices to show that $V_i \cap C_j \neq V_j \cap C_i$ for some i, j. Let $U_i = B_i \cap r^{-1}[V_i]$ and $x_i = e(y_i)$ for $i < n$. Then $\vec{x} \in \prod \vec{U}$ and $\bigwedge \vec{x} = 0$. Hence, there exist $i, j < n$ and

$z \in U_i \cap B_j$ such that $-z \in U_j \cap B_i$. Letting $w = r(z)$, we have $w \in V_i \cap C_j$ and $-w \in V_j \cap C_i$. □

Corollary 5.1.13. *For each $d \leq \omega$, the d-ary* SFN *is preserved by retracts.*

5.2. **Finite functors destroying ternary commutativity.** Given a topological space X, its nth symmetric power is the quotient $\mathrm{SP}^n(X)$ of X^n with respect to the right action of S_n defined by $xg = x \circ g$ for all $x\colon n \to X$ and all bijective $g\colon n \to n$. For example, $(a,a,b,c)/S_4 = (a,b,c,a)/S_4$ but if $a \neq b$ then $(a,a,b,c)/S_4 \neq (a,b,c,b)/S_4$. Given $0 < m < n < \omega$ and an infinite cardinal κ, consider the problem of whether or not $\mathrm{SP}^m(2^\kappa)$ is homeomorphic to $\mathrm{SP}^n(2^\kappa)$. If $\kappa = \omega$, then $2^\kappa \cong \mathrm{SP}^m(2^\kappa) \cong \mathrm{SP}^n(2^\kappa)$ for the trivial reason that 2^ω is the only second-countable crowded Boolean space (up to homeomorphism). If $\kappa = \omega_1$, then still $2^\kappa \cong \mathrm{SP}^m(2^\kappa) \cong \mathrm{SP}^n(2^\kappa)$ but the proof, due to Ščepin, is now difficult.[23] But if $\kappa \geq \omega_2$, then and $\mathrm{SP}^n(2^\kappa)$ is not even (homeomorphic to) a retract of $\mathrm{SP}^m(2^\kappa)$. This is also due to Ščepin [16],[24] who also proved in [16] that if $1 < m < n < \omega$ and $\kappa \geq \omega_2$, then $\mathrm{SP}^n(\mathrm{SP}^m(2^\kappa))$ is not homeomorphic to $\mathrm{SP}^m(\mathrm{SP}^n(2^\kappa))$.

A similar phenomenon occurs for the Vietoris hyperspace operator, which we denote by Exp. Trivially, $2^\omega \cong \mathrm{Exp}(2^\omega)$. Nontrivially, Ščepin proved that $2^{\omega_1} \cong \mathrm{Exp}(2^{\omega_1})$ just as he did for symmetric powers. Yet Shapiro proved that if $\kappa \geq \omega_2$, then $\mathrm{Exp}(2^\kappa)$ is not a continuous image of 2^κ. [14]

For the purposes of this section, we will only use a weak version of the above results.

Theorem 5.2.1. $\mathrm{Exp}(2^{\omega_2})$ *and* $\mathrm{SP}^n(2^{\omega_2})$ *for $n \geq 2$ are not retracts of* 2^{ω_2}.

Corollary 5.2.2. $\mathrm{Exp}(2^{\omega_2})$ *and* $\mathrm{SP}^n(2^{\omega_2})$ *for $n \geq 2$ are not AE(0).*

Proof. Suppose X is one of the spaces in the statement of the corollary, $\kappa \geq \aleph_3$, and there are continuous maps $X \xleftarrow{r} 2^\kappa \xleftarrow{e} X$ such that $r \circ e = \mathrm{id}\colon X \to X$. Choose $M \prec \mathfrak{H}$ such that $\omega_2 \cup \{X, r, e\} \subset M$ and $|M| = \aleph_2$. Then $X/M \cong X$ and $2^\kappa/M \cong 2^{\omega_2}$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.1.5, X/M is a retract of $2^\kappa/M$. Thus, we contradict Theorem 5.2.1. □

(The above Corollary is not new, but the above proof is a pleasing example of the elementary substructure technique.)

The symmetric powers and the Vietoris hyperspace operators are made functors from Cpct_0 to Cpct_0 in the obvious way:

- $\mathrm{SP}^n(f\colon X \to Y)((x_i)_{i<n}/S_n) = (f(x_i))_{i<n}/S_n$.
- $\mathrm{Exp}(f\colon X \to Y)(K) = f[K]$.

Observe that these functors naturally restrict to functors from Fin to Fin.

Let exp and sp^n denote the Stone duals of the functors Exp and SP^n, respectively. These duals are unique up to isomorphism.

---

[23] Ščepin showed that every $\mathrm{SP}^n\left(2^\lambda\right)$ is kappa-metrizable [15, Cor. 1], that kappa-metrizable Boolean spaces of weight $\leq \aleph_1$ are AE(0) [15, Thm. 5], and that 2^{ω_1} is the only AE(0) space with the property that every point has character $\aleph_1$ [17, Thm. 9]. See also [5] for proofs of these facts in terms of Boolean algebras.

[24] Ščepin explicitly proved that $\mathrm{SP}^n(2^\kappa) \ncong \mathrm{SP}^m(2^\kappa)$, but his proof clearly shows more, that $\mathrm{SP}^n(2^\kappa)$ is not a retract of $\mathrm{SP}^m(2^\kappa)$.

Theorem 5.2.3. *If F is* exp *or* sp^n *for some $n \geq 2$, then there is a finite Boolean algebra B with subalgebras A_i for $i < 3$ such that $\vec{A}$ commutes well in B but $(\mathrm{ran}(F(\mathrm{id}\colon A_i \to B)))_{i<3}$ does not weakly commute well in $F(B)$.*

Proof. Let G be a free Boolean algebra generated by an independent sequence $(g_\alpha)_{\alpha<\omega_2}$. Let $H_s = \langle \{g_\alpha \mid \alpha \in s\}\rangle$ for $s \in [\omega_2]^{<\aleph_0}$. By Lemma 2.2.7, $(H_{f(i)})_{i<3}$ commutes wells for all $f\colon 3 \to [\omega_2]^{<\aleph_0}$. Let $K = \exp(G)$ and, for each $s \in [\omega_2]^{<\aleph_0}$,

$$L_s = \mathrm{ran}(F(\mathrm{id}\colon H_s \to G)).$$

Choose a Davies sequence $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha\leq\omega_2}$; note that $\neg(\alpha) + 1 \leq 3$ for all $\alpha < \omega_2$. Since K is not projective, it follows from Theorem 5.1.7 that $(L_{f(i)})_{i<3}$ does not weakly commute well for some $f\colon 3 \to [\omega_2]^{<\aleph_0}$. Let $A_i = H_{f(i)}$ and $B = \left\langle \bigcup \vec{A} \right\rangle$. □

Exercise 5.2.4. Find small Boolean algebras $A_0, A_1, A_2 \leq B$ witnessing the above corollary for $F = \exp$. Do likewise for sp^2.

By results of Heindorf and Shapiro, the above destructions of various forms of ternary commutativity by Exp and SP^n do not have binary analogs.

Theorem 5.2.5 ([5, Lem. 4.3.3, 4.3.5])**.** *If $A_0 \mathop{\downarrow} A_1$ in B and F is* exp *or* sp^2*, then $\mathop{\downarrow}(\mathrm{ran}(F(\mathrm{id}\colon A \to C)))_{i<2}$ in $F(B)$.*

The proof of Lemma 4.3.5 from [5] routinely generalizes from sp^2 to arbitrary sp^n.

Corollary 5.2.6. *If F is* exp *or* sp^n *for some $n \geq 2$, then there is a finite Boolean algebra B with subalgebras A_i for $i < 3$ such that $\vec{A}$ commutes in B but $(\mathrm{ran}(F(\mathrm{id}\colon A_i \to B)))_{i<3}$ does not weakly commute in $F(B)$.*

For the purposes of Exercise 5.2.4, we find the following the simplest implementation of exp.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Filt}(A) &= \{F \subset A \mid F \text{ is a (proper) filter of } A\} \\
[a]_A &= \{F \in \mathrm{Filt}(A) \mid a \in F\} \\
\exp(A) &= \langle \{[a]_A \mid a \in A\}\rangle \leq \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{Filt}(A)) \\
\exp(f\colon A \to B)([a]_A) &= [f(a)]_B
\end{aligned}$$

If A is a finite Boolean algebra, then $\exp(A) = \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{Filt}(A))$ and $|\mathrm{Filt}(A)| = |A| - 1$ because every filter of A is principal. The above implementation also makes clear that if $A_i \leq B$ for $i \in I$, then

$$\mathrm{ran}\left(\exp\left(\mathrm{id}\colon \bigcap \vec{A} \to B\right)\right) = \bigcap_{i\in I} \mathrm{ran}(\exp(\mathrm{id}\colon A_i \to B)).$$

Thus, exp preserves limits of embeddings into a common Boolean algebra. Hence, Exp preserves colimits of quotients of a common Boolean space.

Following [5], the functor sp^n is easier to implement.

- $\mathrm{sp}^n(A)$ is the subalgebra of $\bigoplus(A)_{i<n}$ fixed by action of S_n defined by $\sigma(\oplus_i(a)) = \oplus_{\sigma(i)}(a)$ for $a \in A$ and extended homomorphically to $\bigoplus(A)_{i<n}$.
- $\mathrm{sp}^n(f\colon A \to B)(\bigwedge_{i<m}\bigvee_{j<n} \oplus_i(a_{i,j})) = \bigwedge_{i<m}\bigvee_{j<n} \oplus_i(f(a_{i,j}))$.

We see that, like exp, sp^n preserves limits of embeddings into a common Boolean algebra. Hence, SP^n preserves colimits of quotients of a common Boolean space. Therefore, by Corollary 5.1.8:

Corollary 5.2.7. *If F is* Exp *or* SP^n *for some $n \geq 2$, then there exist finite sets a_0, a_1, a_2 such that the commutative 3-cube*

$$\left(F\left(\pi^{b(s)}_{b(t)} \colon 2^{b(s)} \to 2^{b(t)}\right) \;\middle|\; s \subset t \subset 3\right)$$

is not 3-commutative where $b(\varnothing) = \bigcup \vec{a}$, $b(s) = \bigcap_{i \in s} a_i$ for $s \neq \varnothing$, and $\pi^p_q((x_i)_{i\in p}) = (x_i)_{i \in q}$.

Given b as in the above corollary,

$$\left(\pi^{b(s)}_{b(t)} \colon 2^{b(s)} \to 2^{b(t)} \;\middle|\; s \subset t \subset 3\right)$$

is 3-commutative.[25] Thus, Exp and SP^n do not preserve ternary commutativity in the category Fin.

Exercise 5.2.8. Find a 3-commutative 3-cube in the category Fin whose objects are small finite sets and whose 3-commutativity is destroyed by Exp. Do likewise for SP^2.

References

[1] R. O. Davies. *Covering the plane with denumerably many curves.* J. London Math. Soc. **38** (1963), 433–438.

[2] R. Freese and J. B. Nation. *Projective lattices.* Pacific Journal of Mathematics, **75** (1978), 93–106.

[3] S. Fuchino, S. Koppelberg, S. Shelah. *Partial orderings with the weak Freese-Nation property.* Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **80** (1996), no. 1, 35–54.

[4] R. Haydon. *On a problem of Pełczynski: Miljutin spaces, Dugundji spaces, and AE(0-dim).* Studia Mathematica (1974), 23–31.

[5] L. Heindorf and L. B. Shapiro. *Nearly Projective Boolean Algebras.* with an appendix by S. Fuchino, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1596**, Springer-Verlag, 1994.

[6] S. Jackson and R. D. Mauldin. *On a lattice problem of H. Steinhaus.* J. Amer. Math. Soc. **15** (2002), no. 4, 817–856.

[7] S. Koppelberg. *Handbook of Boolean algebras, Vol. 1.* edited by J. D. Monk with R. Bonnet, North-Holland, 1989.

[8] S. Koppelberg. *Projective Boolean algebras,* Chapter 20 of: J. D. Monk with R. Bonnet (Eds.), Handbook of Boolean algebras, Vol. 3, North-Holland, 1989, 741–774.

[9] K. Kunen. *Set Theory.* Studies in Logic: Mathematical Logic and Foundations **34**, College Publications, 2011.

[10] K. Kuratowksi. *Topology, Vol. 1.* Academic Press, 1966.

[11] D. Milovich. *The (λ, κ)-Freese-Nation property for Boolean algebras and compacta.* Order **29** (2012), 361–379.

[12] D. Milovich. *On the Strong Freese-Nation property.* to appear in Order. See also arXiv:1412.7443.

[13] D. Milovich. *Noetherian types of homogeneous compacta and dyadic compacta.* Topology Appl. **156** (2008), 443–464.

[14] L. B. Šapiro. *The space of closed subsets of $D^{\aleph_2}$ is not a dyadic bicompactum.* Soviet Math. Dokl. **17** (1976), no. 3, 937–941.

[15] E. V. Ščepin. *On κ-metrizable spaces.* Math. USSR-Izv. **14** (1980), no. 2, 406–440.

[16] E. V. Shchepin. *Functors and uncountable powers of compacta.* Russian Math. Surveys, **36** (1981), no. 3, 1–71.

[17] E. V. Ščepin. *Topology of limit spaces with uncountable inverse spectra.* Russian Math. Surveys **31** (1976), no. 5, 155–191.

[18] S. Sirota. *Spectral representation of spaces of closed subsets of bicompacta.* Soviet Math. Doklady, **9** (1968), 997–1000.

[25] This is easily checked, either directly from Definition 2.3.1 or by the Stone dual of Lemma 2.2.7.

[19] D. Soukup. *Davies-trees in infinite combinatorics*, Logic Colloquium 2014, arXiv:1407.3604.

E-mail address: dkm@alum.mit.edu
URL: http://dkmj.org/academic

Dept. of Mathematics and Physics, Texas A&M International University, 5201 University Blvd., Laredo, TX 78041, USA